Research Note 81-8

A RESEARCH STUDY TO DEVELOP AN ARMY-WIDE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TRAINING MODEL VOLUME I

Dale K. Brown
Human Sciences Research, Inc.

AD-A148 342

ARI FIELD UNIT AT PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

DTIC FILE COPY

DEC 4 1984

U. S. Army

Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

March 1979

84 11 2 064

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

UNCLASSIFIED
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER Research Note 81-8	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. / 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) A RESEARCH STUDY TO DEVELOP AN ARMY-WIDE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TRAINING MODEL-VOLUME I	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final Report December 1978-April 1979
	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER HSR-RR-79/6-M1
7. AUTHOR(s) Dale K. Brown	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) DAHC19-78-C-0019
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Human Sciences Research, Inc. 7710 Old Springhouse Road McLean, VA 22102	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 2Q162717A767
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Alexandria, Office, Defense Supply Service-Washington, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333	12. REPORT DATE March 1979
	13. NUMBER OF PAGES 112
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office) ARI Field Unit-Monterey Box 5787 Presidio of Monterey, CA 93940	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
	15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Equal Opportunity	Institutional Discrimination
Education and Training	Army Equal Opportunity Program
Racism	Training Model
Sexism	Behavior Change Strategies
Personal Discrimination	Race Relations

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

In 1976-77, a study of race relations and equal opportunity education and training in the Army was undertaken. One conclusion of that study was that a comprehensive model should be developed which would bring a systematic structure to all EO education and training being conducted for Army members. The present study attempts to do that. Volume I describes the three major components of the model, Individual EO Training in Army Schools, Unit EO Training, and EO Training for Unit Supervisors, Leaders and Managers. Each component is described in terms of its objectives, its target audience(s),

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

Item 19 (Cont'd)

Institutional Change
Organizational Change
Organizational Development

Item 20 (Cont'd)

recommended training methods and technologies, content, requirements for delivery of training, and the recommended methods for evaluating both the training process and the results of training and for feeding evaluation and procedures employed in developing the comprehensive model. An Executive Summary precedes Volume I.

A-1

FOREWORD

In 1976, at the request of DA/DCSPER, ARI conducted Army-wide analysis of the Army RR/EO Education and Training Program (ARI Tech Report TR-B-9). One of the findings of this research indicated there was a lack of an underlying model which unified the different elements of the program in a coherent manner. In FY 78, at the request of DA/DCSPER and US ADMINCEN, ARI initiated research to remedy this deficiency. The research reported here in two volumes attempts to provide the broad conceptual framework in which the diverse elements at all the different levels of equal opportunity directly are interrelated in a comprehensive, coherent, well-articulated and effective program. Volume I describes the three major components of the model and Volume II describes the background of the study and the information and procedures employed in developing the model. The research was accomplished under Army Project 2Q162717A767, Techniques for Improving Soldier Productivity, as an in-house effort in the FY 78 work program augmented by a contract with Human Sciences Research, Inc., under contract #DAHC 19-78-C-0019.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Study Title:	A Research Study to Develop an Army-Wide Equal Opportunity Training Model
Author:	Dale K. Brown Human Sciences Research, Inc.
Principal Investigator:	Peter G. Nordlie Human Sciences Research, Inc.
Sponsor:	Alexandria Office, Defense Supply Service-Washington
Contract Number:	DAHC 19-78-C-0019
Contracting Officer's Technical Representative:	Dr. Dwight J. Goehring U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Even though race relations equal opportunity training began on an Army-wide basis as far back as 1969, there has never been an overall training model on which the total training program could be based. There has been no overall conception within which all the diverse elements and all the different levels of equal opportunity training could be interrelated into a coherent, comprehensive, well-articulated and effective program.

A critique of Army EO training as presently conducted points out several important facts.

First, equal opportunity training is required at all levels of schools in the Army and in all units. In other words, EO training is seen as a universal educational experience required by all Army personnel and not just a specific educational experience for some subgroup of the total.

Second, there exists no underlying theoretical model which unifies and makes coherent the many diverse elements of the program.

Third, there appears to have been an unquestioned acceptance of some assumptions about suitable methods for EO training–small group guided discussions–and that a failure in communications was one of the root causes of racial tension. It seems to have been further assumed that racial harmony was a major objective of unit race relations training, but racial harmony is never clearly defined.

PREVIOUS PAGE IS BLANK

Fourth, the more recent policy statements have begun to include goal statements concerning the elimination of discrimination which tended to be absent from earlier goal statements. Still, the policy statements tend to exhibit an almost schizophrenic character with respect to whether policy is oriented toward awareness or toward the elimination of discrimination. Within the same policy statement one can find substantial evidence in support of either view.

Fifth, the original policy on race relations/equal opportunity training and all subsequent modifications do not appear to have been based on any hard evidence that the training content and methods required could or would achieve the intended objectives.

A major conclusion of an Army study assessing EO education and training was that a whole new approach to EO education and training should be developed and substituted for the existing approach. The new approach should provide a coherent, overall program which interrelates the training received at entry points, school training at various levels, and unit training. The study also identified a number of characteristics, listed below, which would be desirable for such a model to have.

Leader Training–Primary emphasis in the program should be to effectively train Army leadership at all levels in awareness of their EO responsibilities and knowledge of how to carry them out.

Job Related–Training at every level should be geared to the jobs of persons at that level.

Progressive Training–Training received at one level or time should be reinforced and built upon by training at the next level or time.

Method of Instruction Appropriate to Content–Training methods should be related to content. Using small group seminars to impart essentially cognitive and factual information is as inappropriate as attempting experiential learning in a one hundred-person group.

Specific Objectives Clearly Established for Each Course–Each course should have specific, behavioral objectives.

Content Related to Training Objectives–Course content should be scrutinized to ensure that each part is necessary for the achievement of the training objectives.

New Content–New course content at many levels needs to be developed in order to meet new training needs regarding institutional discrimination.

the issue of "reverse discrimination," the leader's role and responsibilities in the EO program, and the basic nature of the equal opportunity problem in the Army.

Greater Emphasis on Individual Training--The training program should be more balanced than it has been in that individual training in schools should better prepare students for the EO problems they will encounter in the field.

Elimination of Negative Aspects of Course Content--Course content should be scrutinized to eliminate aspects which tend to produce negative responses from students with no compensating positive effect. Past research has repeatedly found a need to make course content:

- less repetitious
- less black-white oriented
- more relevant to Army life
- less centered on minority history and culture
- more relevant to current unit problems
- less slanted to benefit minorities
- less blaming of whites.

Many changes could be made without impairing the achievement of training objectives.

EO Training More Closely Tied to Affirmative Actions--The training program should be more explicitly related to and supportive of the Affirmative Actions component of the EO program. Heretofore, the components have been too unrelated and independent of each other.

Integral Feedback and Assessment System--The training program should have a built-in feedback and assessment system which provides a continuous assessment of the extent to which the program objectives are being achieved. Such a system should also be used to sense the need for changes in the program as a function of altered situations or the arising of new needs. This could provide a built-in mechanism for accomplishing adaptive change in the training program.

These were the minimum characteristics considered in developing a new approach to EO training.

The various statements relating to EO training contained in AR 600-21 have been consolidated into three overall objectives:

- to eliminate personal discrimination;
- to eliminate institutional discrimination; and
- to effectively develop and conduct an EO program.

The training model has been developed under the assumption that these represent the ultimate objectives of all EO training in the Army.

The model consists of three separate components, each of which contains content relevant to each of these objectives, and each oriented to a particular target audience or set of audiences which, taken together, include all Army members. The three components are summarized in the following table.

More detailed outlines of the components are contained at the end of this Executive Summary.

Several other points should be recognized as resulting from the development of this model. A number of conclusions and recommendations relevant to future development and implementation of the model appear below.

1. There must be systematic study of the personnel demands created by the model, and these must be related to plans for selection of EO specialists to attend DRRI and Unit Discussion Leader Courses (UDLC).

2. Training provided to Army personnel at DRRI will need to be modified to include all content and skills required for implementation of this model.

3. Selection criteria and the quality of training for UDL must be upgraded so that Unit EO Training is not so heavily dependent upon chain of command participation in teaching and facilitating roles, while still relying on command initiative as a basis for program support.

4. Considerable effort should be invested in the design of a plan, instruments and supporting procedures for the ongoing assessment of EO training, beginning at the initiation of training under the model.

5. Immediate development should be initiated on the lesson plans and programs of instruction required under the model, to minimize lag time prior to implementation.

6. If resources are not available to develop all three of the model's components simultaneously, first priority should be given to EO Training for Unit Supervisors, Leaders and Managers. Job-relevant training for decisionmakers is of immediate and pressing importance, and this is the most timely way of providing it.

SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE MODEL FOR EO EDUCATION AND TRAINING

	Individual EO Training in Army Schools	Unit EO Training	EO Training for Unit Supervisors, Leaders and Managers
OBJECTIVES The overriding objective of the Army EO Program, as with all other Army programs, is to contribute to the National defense mission through readiness and ability to perform the unit mission. This objective is supported by the following specific objectives 1. To eliminate personal discrimination; 2. To eliminate institutional discrimination; 3. To enhance EO Program effectiveness.	1. To provide each Army member with a career-long set of training experiences to support the global objectives of the EO Program. 2. To relate EO education and training to the general types of job responsibilities to be experienced by the student upon leaving the school.	1. To allow unit members to raise EO-related questions and problems which can be addressed by unit leaders. 2. To allow unit leaders to identify and attempt to resolve EO-related questions and problems present in the unit.	1. To relate prior EO education and training experiences to present job responsibilities. 2. To reinforce leader awareness of EO responsibilities. 3. To enhance the ability of the unit chain of command to work as a team on EO matters, as in other areas.
TARGET AUDIENCE(S)	Every Army member who undergoes some formal training in an Army service or professional school and in basic and advanced individual training. Also those Army members selected to serve on boards or panels which make decisions about career-enhancing opportunities for other Army members.	Every Army member assigned to an active Army unit or to a reserve unit, including National Guard.	Every Army member of grade E5 or above who has some input to work activities and/or decisions which have potential EO implications. This includes: (a) training for company-level leaders; (b) Executive Seminars for higher echelon leaders and their staffs.
PROGRAM CONTENT 1. Personal discrimination	1. a. Training aimed at modifying individual behavior to eliminate personal discrimination and the perception of personal discrimination. b. Training for leaders in controlling and preventing personal discrimination among subordinates.	1. a. Identification of problem areas related to personal discrimination in the unit. b. Training aimed at changing the personal discrimination behavior of unit members.	1. a. Reinforcement of leadership principles useful for preventing and controlling personal discrimination. b. Reinforcement of basic concepts related to personal discrimination and its elimination.

	Individual EO Training in Army Schools	Unit EO Training	EO Training for Unit Supervisors, Leaders and Managers
2. Institutional discrimination	2. a. Training aimed at leader ability to analyze each personnel decision, his/her role in that decision, and the EO implications of personnel decisions. b. Practice in making non-discriminatory decisions.	2. a. Training aimed at enhancing unit members' ability to understand institutional discrimination and each individual's rights to fair treatment in all areas of Army life.	2. a. Reinforcement of leadership principles useful in eliminating institutional discrimination. b. Relating leadership principles to specific job responsibilities of the leader.
3. EO Program effectiveness	3. a. Training aimed at leader ability to understand EO objectives and responsibilities at each level of leadership. b. Training aimed at each leader's ability to enhance EO Program effectiveness at his/her level.	3. a. Explanation of all EO policies and procedures relevant to unit members.	3. a. Reinforcement of knowledge and skills needed to run a Unit EO Program effectively.
TRAINING METHODS 1. Academic methods	1. Lectures, films, outside readings, self-guided instruction, etc.	1. Lectures, films, demonstrations, etc.	1. Lectures, films, readings, self-guided instruction, etc.
2. Experiential methods	2. Group discussion, planned exercises, problem-solving groups, etc.	2. Unit seminars (guided discussion), planned exercises, etc.	2. Group discussion, task-oriented working groups, etc.
FREQUENCY OF TRAINING:	Once in every formal school experience; and in preparation for assignment to a selection board or other decision-making group	Quarterly, or more frequently if needed.	Once in each new leadership assignment.
DELIVERY OF TRAINING:	DRRI-trained instructors.	Unit leaders assisted by Unit Discussion Leaders (UDL) and others as needed for topics.	DRRI-trained instructors, with assistance of local OE staff, if necessary or desired.
ASSESSMENT OF TRAINING 1. Process evaluation	1. a. Local assessment by school staff and/or qualified outside observers. b. Local use of student critiques. c. Assessment by TRADOC/EO.	1. a. Assessment by unit chain of command and UDL. b. Outside assessment by brigade or higher EO staff, if possible. c. Student critiques.	1. a. Local evaluation by staff. b. Local evaluation by student critique. c. Evaluation by MACOM

	Individual EO Training in Army Schools	Unit EO Training	EO Training for Unit Supervisors, Leaders and Managers
2. Impact assessment	2. a. Pre- and post-training measures related to training objectives. b. Long-term analysis of institutional statistics by MACOM's and IAA.	2. a. Feedback from unit members. b. Followup evaluation of complaint frequency, seriousness, etc.	2. a. Long-term analysis of unit and post statistics on institutional factors by post, MACOM.
ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.	1. Records of individual participation in formal training must be accurate. 2. Special orientations for tenant and guest members are included here. 3. Special training for specific MOSs, e.g., MP, is also included here. 4. All instructors should be DRRI-trained.	1. UEM training must be upgraded. 2. Selection for UEM training must be more stringent. 3. Procedures for local monitoring of training must be developed. 4. Lesson plans for commonly occurring problem areas should be made available Army wide.	1. This component includes Executive Seminars for senior leaders at Division and MACOM levels. 2. This component must take advantage of the local orientation for incoming commanders and of command and staff conferences. 3. Scheduling of attendance must be carefully attended to so that the experience comes within eight weeks of accepting current assignment. 4. Attendance records must be accurate and current.

Individual EO Training in Army Schools

- Objectives:

  1. To provide each Army leader with a career-long set of EO education and training experiences to enable him or her to:

     a. detect and eliminate personal discrimination;
     b. detect and eliminate institutional discrimination;
     c. establish and administer an effective EO program as required by regulation.

  2. To relate EO education and training to the general and specific job duties and responsibilities which occur at the various levels of leadership.

- Target Audiences: All Army members from the entering enlistee through noncommissioned, warrant and commissioned officers as they attend Army schools and training programs. These schools and programs include:

  1. Enlisted Schools

     a. Basic Training
     b. Advanced Individual Training
     c. Primary NCO Course
     d. Basic NCO Course
     e. Advanced NCO Course
     f. Senior NCO Course
     g. Sergeants-Major Academy

  2. Warrant Officer Schools

     a. Warrant Officer Candidate Course
     b. Warrant Officer Pre-Appointment Course
     c. Warrant Officer Post-Appointment Course
     d. Warrant Officer Senior Course

  3. Commissioned Officer Schools

     a. Officer Candidate Course
     b. Reserve Officer Training Course
     c. U.S. Military Academy

d. Officer Basic Course
e. Officer Advanced Course
f. Battalion and Brigade Commander Orientation Courses
g. Command and General Staff College
h. Army War College
i. New General Officer Orientation Course

- Training Content: The content of training will vary considerably from one school to another, depending on the level and type of responsibility for which students are being prepared. This includes both "awareness training" of a general nature and specific job-related training of the following types:

1. Awareness Training:

a. Cognitive
   (1) Policy
   (2) Facts about various cultures
   (3) Historical background of EO
   (4) Role of women in Army and society
   (5) Understanding basic concepts fundamental to an understanding of EO
      (a) prejudice
      (b) institutional discrimination
      (c) personal discrimination
      (d) stereotypes
      (e) affirmative action
      (f) reverse discrimination
   (6) Understanding the relationship between beliefs and decisions
   (7) Enumeration of areas where institutional discrimination can occur
   (8) Individual rights and responsibilities
   (9) Use of statistics in diagnosing institutional discrimination
   (10) Recognizing the effects of discrimination on mission effectiveness.

b. Belief/attitude/perception
   (1) Training to counter stereotypes and other undesirable beliefs
   (2) Effects of perceptions and beliefs on behavior

c. Behavior-oriented training
   (1) Defining acceptable and unacceptable behavior
      (a) verbal (epithets, jokes, sexist language, etc.)
      (b) non-verbal
   (2) Role of perceptions in interpreting another's behavior

(3) Value of a personal behavioral example
(4) Peer pressure and its effects on behavior

2. Job-Related Training

a. Training aimed at reducing personal discrimination
   (1) Army policy on personal discrimination
   (2) Establishing standards of conduct for the unit
   (3) Enforcing standards of conduct
   (4) Defining sanctions for violation of standards
   (5) Setting a personal behavior example
   (6) Diagnosing unit climate on racism/sexism issues
      (a) unit survey
      (b) informal feedback
      (c) personal observation
   (7) Developing solutions to problems of personal discrimination
      (a) counseling
      (b) training for unit
      (c) training for chain of command
      (d) modification of policies, procedures

b. Training aimed at eliminating institutional discrimination
   (1) Recognizing institutional discrimination and how it affects the organization and the individual
   (2) Recognizing the role of the leader in eliminating institutional discrimination
   (3) Decisions which may result in institutional discrimination
   (4) Enumeration of decision areas to which the leader has input
   (5) Defining the leader's input to each type of decision
   (6) Defining rules for non-discriminatory decisionmaking

c. Training aimed at development and administration of an EO Program
   (1) Understanding Army EO objectives
   (2) Establishing local EO objectives
      (a) for training
      (b) for affirmative actions
   (3) Identifying resources (E/T and AA)
      (a) in the unit
      (b) outside the unit
   (4) Staffing an EO Program
   (5) Defining staff responsibilities
   (6) Defining proper communication channels

(7) Establishing a record-keeping system
(8) Establishing procedures for handling of complaints
(9) Publicizing the program

- Training Methods: The full range of training methods and technologies will be applied in this component, under the general principle that training method be matched to the particular target audience and the particular content being presented. Some general principles are presented in Chapter III.

- Delivery of Training: It is recommended that all EO training in this Component be presented only by DRRI-trained instructors.

- Assessment of Training: Training conducted in this component of the model should be evaluated in the following ways:

  1. Process Evaluation
     a. Local, by means of student and instructor critiques.
     b. TRADOC, by means of systematic research and evaluation.

  2. Impact Assessment
     a. Local, by means of achievement tests, attitude inventories.
     b. DA, by means of longitudinal research on an Army-wide basis.

- Special Considerations: It is recommended that this component of the model include a provision for the development of special orientations for incoming members of the numerous selection and placement boards which are integral to Army functioning.

Unit EO Training

- Overall objective: To eliminate both personal and institutional discrimination from the unit.

- Specific objectives: Objectives for specific unit EO training sessions will be defined on an *ad hoc* basis, depending on the topic or problem area being addressed.

- Overall approach: Unit EO Training consists of a four-step process of:

  1. Problem diagnosis
  2. Training program design
  3. Implementation of training
  4. Follow-up assessment of process and impacts

- Target audiences: Unit members can be subdivided into five groups, based on rank or grade; any one or more of these groups might be a target audience for a given topic. The groups are:

  1. Junior enlisted (E1-E4)
  2. Junior NCO (E5-E6)
  3. Senior NCO (E7-E9)
  4. Company grade officers
  5. Field grade officers

- Problem diagnosis methods: Unit-specific problems may be identified through a variety of formal and informal methods, including:

  1. a Unit Diagnostic Survey;
  2. an Equal Opportunity Council;
  3. active efforts by the chain of command to detect incipient problems, through verbal and non-verbal behavioral signs;
  4. informal conversations and interviews; and
  5. generally keeping vertical communication channels open.

- Content of Unit EO Training: Specific training content for each session will be determined by the problem diagnosis process. Generic categories of content for Unit EO Training are listed below and discussed in Chapter IV:

  1. Personal race and sex discrimination in the unit.
  2. Institutional race and sex discrimination in the unit.
  3. Personal race and sex discrimination on post, outside the unit.
  4. Institutional race and sex discrimination on post outside the unit.
  5. Race and sex discrimination in the off-post civilian community.
  6. Supplementary topics to generate and increase awareness of EO subject matter as it pertains to unit life.

- Training methods: Any of the methods described in Chapter IV may be applicable to Unit EO Training. The best method for each session will be determined by a variety of local conditions and circumstances, including:

  1. the particular training topic;
  2. the time available for preparation;
  3. the personnel and other resources available;
  4. the particular target audience.

- Delivery component: The unit commander is personally responsible for Unit EO Training and must make the best possible use of available resources. Chief among those resources is the Unit Discussion Leader.

- Assessment component: The Unit Training Component should be evaluated in terms of both process and impacts. Each individual session should be evaluated as follows:

  1. Process evaluation by means of:

     a. participant critique sheets;
     b. a post-mortem by knowledgeable observers.

  2. Impact assessment by means of:

     a. any of the problem diagnosis methods described above;
     b. specific follow-up of results as compared to the specific objectives established prior to the session.

- Additional recommendations: It is also recommended that:

  1. Unit Discussion Leader selection criteria be made more stringent, since this is the most immediately accessible resource the commander has and is likely to have in the future;

  2. UDL training be made uniform across the Army, and required at each installation. UDL training be upgraded in quality, and content be modified to include such topics as the use of surveys to diagnose issues and problems in EO at unit level;

  3. training materials be developed on each of the general and specific subject areas outlined in Chapter IV;

  4. these training materials be made widely available to unit commanders;

  5. training received by unit commanders include coverage of the Unit Training Component and the commander's role in it; and

  6. training received by all present and future members of the unit chain of command emphasize the institutional component of discrimination and the leader's role in eliminating it.

EO Training for Unit Supervisors, Leaders and Managers

The Supervisor, Leader and Manager (SLM) Training Component of the Comprehensive EO Training Model has two major elements, described in summary form below.

Unit Leader Training

- Objectives:

  1. To relate prior EO education and training experiences to current job responsibilities.

  2. To make leaders aware of their roles and responsibilities in Army efforts to eliminate discrimination.

  3. To enhance the ability of the unit chain of command to work as a team in eliminating discrimination.

- Target Audience: All leaders in company-equivalent units or work groups who have some input to decisions which affect other soldiers' working lives or careers, in the short or long term.

- Training Content: This module has two types of content, described below:

  1. Awareness training, whose objectives are to strengthen leader awareness of:

     a. the concepts of personal and institutional discrimination;
     b. cultural diversity in the Army;
     c. the changing roles of women in society and in the Army; and
     d. the role of the leader in the Army's EO Program.

  2. Job-related training, whose objectives are:

     a. to enable each unit leader to define each type of decision he or she participates in and the exact nature of that participation, i.e., initiation or recommendation, participation as a member of a group (board, panel, council, etc.), approval or denial or recommendations initiated by others, or total control over the decision.

     b. to enable each unit leader to identify the possible discriminatory results of each of those decision inputs.

     c. to enable each unit leader to identify all possible ways in which personal and institutional bias might enter into the decision processes identified above.

d. to enable each unit leader to identify methods for detecting and preventing personal and institutional bias from entering into the decision processes.

e. to enable each unit leader to define his or her role in a discrimination free decision process, as a member of the leadership team.

- Training Methods: Recommended methods include: lecture; guided group discussion; structured exercises; role playing; task-oriented work groups, each tailored to specific items of content.

- Delivery Component: Training will be delivered by DRRI-trained instructors.

- Assessment:

  1. Process evaluation, through student critiques and instructor self-criticism.

  2. Impact evaluation, through analysis of statistical reports, unit surveys.

- Potential Problem Areas:

  1. Scheduling of individual participants for training to maximize the impact on the individual and the unit.

  2. Scheduling of unit "teams" to be minimally disruptive to unit operations.

  3. Probable shortage of qualified instructors.

Executive Seminars

- Objectives:

  1. To relate prior EO education and training experiences to current job responsibilities.

  2. To make senior leaders and managers aware of the role of policy in eliminating discrimination.

  3. To make senior leaders aware of the importance of high-level command support to the success of the Army EO Program and to increase that support.

- Target Audiences:

  1. Division level

     a. the Division Commander.
     b. the Division Commander's principal staff officers.
     c. the Command Sergeant-Major
     d. all Commanders and Sergeants-Major of brigades and brigade-equivalent units.

  2. MACOM level

     a. the MACOM Commander
     b. the MACOM Commander's principal staff.
     c. the Command Sergeant-Major
     d. all Division Commanders in the MACOM and their Command Sergeants-Major.

- Training Content: Variable, but with emphasis on:

  1. current status reports;
  2. EO implications of policy;
  3. command support for EO.

- Training Methods and Personnel: A variety of combinations, including presentations by guest speakers, workshop problem solving sessions, guided discussions, with the participation, but not necessarily control, of a DRRI graduate.

- Assessment:

  1. Process evaluation through participant critiques and self-criticism.

  2. Impact assessment by follow-up of established plan of action, including goals, tasks, timetables, and responsible individuals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY iii

I. RATIONALE FOR AN ARMY-WIDE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TRAINING MODEL 1

History of EO Training Development 1

Results of EO Training Assessment 8

Desirable Characteristics of an EO Training Model 11

II. THE BASIC UNIFYING CONCEPT 14

The Linkage of Individual Training to Organizational Change 14

The Objectives of EO Training 16

EO Education and Training Program Content 18

Personal Discrimination 18
Institutional Discrimination 20
Administration of EO Programs 22
Summary of Program Content Requirements 22

The Major Components of the Model 22

Individual Training in Army Service and Professional Schools 23
Unit EO Training 24
EO Training for Unit Supervisors, Leaders and Managers 28

Summary 28

III. INDIVIDUAL EO TRAINING IN ARMY SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES 30

Objectives 31

Target Audiences 31

Training Content 32

Training Methods 34

Delivery of Training 37

Assessment of Training 38

Process Evaluation 38

Impact Assessment 39

Additional Considerations 40

Summary 42

IV. THE UNIT TRAINING COMPONENT 43

Objectives of the Unit Training Component 45

The Problem Identification and Resolution Process 46

Problem Diagnosis 47

Design of Problem-Specific Training 49

Target Audiences 49
Training Session Content 51
Program Design 54

Implementing the Training 55

Assessing the Results of Training 56

Summary 56

V. THE SUPERVISOR, LEADER AND MANAGEMENT TRAINING COMPONENT 59

Unit Leader Training 59

Target Audience 60

Training Content 61

Awareness Training 61
Job-Related Training 62

Training Methods 63

The Delivery Component 64

Assessment of Training 64

Anticipated Problems 64

Executive Seminars 65

Target Audience 66
Training Content 66
Training Methods and Trainer Personnel 67
Assessment of Executive Seminars 67

Additional Elements 68

Summary 68

Unit Leader Training 69
Executive Seminars 70
Additional Considerations 72

VI. DELIVERY OF EO EDUCATION AND TRAINING 73

Implications of the Model for DRRI Training 73

The Comprehensive Model 73
The Unit EO Diagnosis and Assessment System (TDAS) 74
Preparation for UDL Training 75

Implications of the Model for UDL Training 75

Potential Problems in the Recommended Delivery System 77

VII. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TRAINING ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK 79

Objectives of the Assessment Component of the Model 80

Assessment Methods 80

The Feedback Loop 82

Summary of the Assessment Component 83

VIII. APPLICATION OF THE MODEL TO THE ARMY RESERVE AND ARMY NATIONAL GUARD 85

The Army Reserve. 85

The Army National Guard. 86

TABLES

Table 1 Army Schools Included in the Individual Training Component of the Model 33

2 Training Content to be Included in Awareness and Job-Related Training 35

3 Decisions Areas Not Related to Specific Schools but Requiring EO Training 41

FIGURE

Figure 1 Matrix Describing Decisions Having EO Implications, Army Personnel Who Make Those Decisions, and the Place Where Training (If Any) is Received As to How to Make the Decisions 25

CHAPTER I

RATIONALE FOR AN ARMY-WIDE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TRAINING MODEL

Even though race relations equal opportunity training began on an Army-wide basis as far back as 1969, there has never been an overall training model on which the total training program could be based. There has been no overall conception within which all the diverse elements and all the different levels of equal opportunity training could be interrelated into a coherent, comprehensive, well-articulated and effective program. This lack of a programmatic conception, or model, is attributable primarily to the particular developmental history of the equal opportunity program in the Army. That developmental history will be briefly reviewed in order to place in perspective the need for an overall model for equal opportunity training.

History of EO Training Development

In the 1960's, the United States was torn by racial conflict. The relatively peaceful confrontations of Little Rock exploded into the violent riots of Watts, Detroit, and Newark, to mention only a few.

The murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., brought forth an outpouring of civil riots throughout the country. Up until this time, the armed forces had been relatively free of racial strife. That picture changed dramatically and rapidly, beginning in the summer of 1969 with major racial incidents reported at almost every Army installation in the U.S. and overseas. Mission readiness could only be adversely affected by these events. Race relations had become a high priority issue for the Army.

The Army responded to this mounting crisis situation with a number of policy statements and specific programs, the major one being the establishment of mandatory race relations/equal opportunity training for all Army personnel. In September 1969, the Chief of Staff directed Headquarters, Continental Army Command, to incorporate instruction in race relations into the Army educational system.[1] The Infantry School at Fort Benning was designated to develop the course of instruction. By September of 1970, a

[1] Human Sciences Research, Inc., *Race Relations and Equal Opportunity in the Army: A Resource Book for Personnel with Race Relations Equal Opportunity Responsibility*. (McLean, Va: Author, February 1973.)

four-hour block of instruction entitled "Leadership Aspects of Race Relations" was included in the Program of Instruction in Officer Basic and Advanced Courses and in NCO Education System Courses. The Infantry School developed a similar course entitled "Race Relations" which was included in Basic Combat Training in early 1971. These were the Army's first efforts to educate and train individuals, both leaders and troops, in areas thought to be relevant to the maintenance of good racial climate.

In addition to the blocks of instruction incorporated into the various schools, by 1971, the Army had initiated *unit training* in EO which came to be the most prominent component of the total program. Guidance issued by CONARC called for workshops and sound-off sessions down to company level, as well as annual race relations instruction for all personnel.[2]

Also in 1971, the Defense Race Relations Institute (DRRI) was established at Patrick Air Force Base. At DRRI, a program of instruction was developed which was to have far-reaching impact on the design and conduct of race relations education and training in the Army. DRRI was chartered to develop a race relations/equal opportunity training program and to train instructors for this program. Operating under pressure of time and circumstances, DRRI came up with a program, borrowed heavily from the Infantry School courses, which was aimed at changing attitudes through increased awareness and understanding of differences in cultures, lifestyles, and values of various ethnic groups and through increased understanding of the white majority in relation to minorities. Each service (except the Marine Corps, which had a separate program) adapted this concept to its specific organization and problems. The program of instruction for DRRI students encompassed four major areas:[3]

- **American Ethnic Studies**—to provide the DRRI student with a knowledge of minority history and the contribution of minority groups to the development of our Nation and the armed forces.

- **Behavioral Sciences**—to provide each student with a common foundation of knowledge on cultural, psychological and social factors relating directly to race relations.

[2]U.S. Army, Continental Army Command, Headquarters, Commander, Continental Army Command Regulation No. 600-3; Race Relations (Fort Monroe, Virginia, 18 May 1971).

[3]U.S. Department of Defense, Race Relations Institute. *The Commander's Notebook on Race Relations; A Guide to the Utilization of the Defense Race Relations Officer/Noncommissioned Officer Team and Implementation of the Core Curriculum in the Field.* Draft (Patrick AFB, Florida: Defense Race Relations Institute, 17 March 1972), para. IV.1.b.

- **Community Involvement**—to provide the students with experience in both minority and majority group culture and lifestyles in various communities out of which the modern serviceman emerges.

- **Group Leadership Practicum**—to provide the student with the theory and practice in leading group discussions utilizing a variety of motivating devices and intra-group dynamics to facilitate dialogue.

The objectives of the initial DRRI curriculum were to provide students with:

1. The opportunity to become aware of and fully understand current DoD, Service, and command equal opportunity and treatment policies and directives, and their relationship to the need for maintaining good order and discipline.

2. A knowledge of minority group history and the contributions of minority groups to the development of our Nation and the armed forces.

3. A knowledge of selected psychological, social, and cultural factors relating to race relations to increase their understanding of the social and behavioral dynamics related to intergroup tensions and conflicts.

4. Racial and ethnic group experiences in various communities to increase their understanding of minority group culture and lifestyles.

5. The opportunity to develop teaching techniques and group skills which will prepare them to lead discussion groups using intergroup conflicts, situation-simulation films and other selected techniques.

6. The capability and judgment to work with their commanding officers in determining the specific needs for a race relations group discussion program and how best to employ the DRRI resources within that command.[4]

[4]U.S. Department of Defense, Defense Race Relations Institute, *Defense Race Relations Institute Commander's Notebook* (Patrick AFB, Fla.: Defense Race Relations Institute, 1 December 1971), Annex IV, pp. 1-2.

Clearly, the emphasis of the training is on *knowledge, awareness, understanding* and *intergroup communications.* At that time, there was no content dealing with how organizations function or specifically with how organizational mechanisms in the Army continue to perpetuate discrimination.

The implicit assumption underlying the original DRRI curriculum seems to be that increased awareness and understanding of minority history and culture and awareness of some of the psychological dynamics of racial prejudice will lead to decreased racial prejudice which in turn will lead to better intergroup communication and less intergroup tension and conflict. There is little or no evidence that such a model is valid. But valid or not, it clearly identifies improved communications and the reduction of intergroup conflict as goals. In view of the current emphasis in EO on institutional discrimination, it is somewhat surprising to note that there has been no indication that helping to eliminate racial discrimination is an explicit goal of the training.

This DRRI approach had a critical impact on Army race relations education policy and practice by virtue of the fact that in January 1972, the Army adopted the policy that every unit in the Army would have a race relations training program using as guidelines a curriculum and educational materials developed by DRRI, to be taught by DRRI-trained instructors.[5] Until early 1974, the DRRI-Developed Core Curriculum formed the basis for the Army's mandatory race relations unit training which was to be conducted by DRRI-trained instructors. The Core Curriculum was organized around six themes or phases:

1. Discussion of DoD and Service race relations policies and goals to set the tone and direction of the educational program.

2. Recognition of personal racism, intentional or otherwise, in oneself and others and how ignorance sustains it.

3. Understanding of how institutions founded upon *majority* values tend to ignore *minority* values, thus polarizing these two groups. This is of particular detriment to *minorities.*

4. Examination of the misunderstanding generated between minority and majority groups in the Service due to poor communication.

[5]Equal Opportunity and Treatment Letter (Washington, D.C.: U.S., Army, Headquarters, 30 June 1972), pp. 2-3.

5. Understanding that the racial problems in the armed services are an extension of those in the Civilian Community and require a knowledge of all the cultural elements represented.

6. Examine this particular Duty Station for its peculiar racial problem.[6]

These themes again emphasize awareness, understanding and communication, but they do not focus on change either for individuals or the organization.

In February 1974, Department of the Army issued AR 600-42 which modified policy for race relations education in the Army. The basic objective of race relations education was: ". . . to maintain the highest degree of organizational and combat readiness by fostering harmonious relations among all military personnel . . . ."[7] The statement of policy emphasized that:

(a) . . . commanders will be alert to the continuing need for promoting racial harmony . . .;

(b) . . . emphasis of the race relations program will be on the development of the teamwork and comradeship that builds pride in unit;

(c) education will include specific efforts to . . . stimulate interracial communication in units; and

(d) . . . instruction will focus on the history, background, lifestyle, contributions, and interactions among ethnic and racial groups.

Three elements of the Army race relations program were identified in AR 600-42:

(a) Individual training which is formal race relations instruction in basic combat training and professional development courses taught in Army service schools and USAR schools;

(b) Unit training which is a comprehensive racial awareness program designed to stimulate interracial communications and to promote racial harmony in units; and

(c) Special training for leaders and managers which is formal instruction in race relations conducted in Army colleges and in special courses.

[6]U.S. Department of Defense, Race Relations Institute, *op. cit.*, 1972, p. 14.

[7]U.S., Army, Secretary. Army Regulation No. 600-42; Personnel–General, Race Relations Education for the Army. Washington, D.C., 1 February 1974, Sec. I, Para. 2.

The new approach to unit training to be substituted for the old core curriculum was a series of mandatory seminars to be held not less than once monthly during prime training time in every unit on a continuing basis. The seminars were to be conducted in platoon-sized groups and were to be led by the unit chain of command. The course outline for the Unit Racial Awareness Program (RAP) was organized into six blocks of instruction:

I. Introduction
II. Personal Racism
III. Interracial and Interethnic Communication
IV. Minorities in American Life
V. Institutional Racism
VI. Racial and Ethnic Awareness

The content of the first four blocks was generally similar to the content of the Core Curriculum which they superceded. The last two blocks, however, dealt with institutional discrimination and actions required to eliminate discrimination. These constitute new major themes in the content of race relations instruction in the Army which appeared for the first time in early 1974.

The RAP seminars were the heart of Army EO unit training from early 1974 until September 1977 when the program was again modified by the issuance of AR 600-21 which restates Army policy on equal opportunity programs and provides new guidance for the equal opportunity education and training program. The new guidance specifies four components of the education and training program and details minimum requirements in each:

1. Entry level training;

2. Individual education for Army leaders, managers and supervisors;

3. Unit training;

4. Unit discussion leader training.

MACOM's were given considerably broader latitude in tailoring the program to their own needs and supplementing the regulation than they had had before. No requirement for minimum numbers of hours of training was specified. A set of guidelines for unit

EO training was provided as an appendix to the regulation. The guidelines specified four learning objectives:

(1) To facilitate and improve the soldier's understanding of the entire Equal Opportunity Program for the United States Army.

(2) To inform unit members about potential sources of minority/gender dissatisfaction and interracial/intersexual tension in the Army and about what the Army is doing to remove any grounds for dissatisfaction and tension in specific areas.

(3) To increase the soldier's understanding and acceptance of different cultural models.

(4) To provide the chain of command with contemporary information and feedback on the status and progress of the Equal Opportunity Program.

The guidelines then suggest a procedure wherein the commander first determines the needs of personnel in his unit for equal opportunity information and then selects the method and content of the training needed based on the initial results of this determination.

DA Pamphlet 600-42 has also been developed which provides outlines of 13 suggested equal opportunity topics which commanders may wish to consider. Once the commander determines the topic and method of presentation, he selects the instructor/project officer/NCO and establishes the time and place of the training. He will assure that the training is scheduled and that attendance is mandatory for all unit personnel and that maximum participation of all members of the command occurs. The guidelines further specify a list of training tasks required to achieve each of the learning objectives noted above.

This thumbnail sketch of the history of race relations education and training in the Army from a policy perspective is intended to provide background for considering the development of a functional model for future Army equal opportunity training which is responsive to projected Army needs. A few observations on this general overview are in order.

First, equal opportunity training[8] is required at all levels of schools in the Army and in all units. In other words, EO training is seen as a universal educational experience

[8]In the new AR 600-21, the name of the program has been changed to the Equal Opportunity Program. This term covers what was formerly covered by the term RR/EO.

required by all Army personnel and not just a specific educational experience for some subgroup of the total.

Second, there exists no underlying theoretical model which unifies and makes coherent the many diverse elements of the program.

Third, there appears to have been an unquestioned acceptance of some assumptions about suitable methods for EO training–small group guided discussions–and that a failure in communications was one of the root causes of racial tension. It seems to have been further assumed that racial harmony was a major objective of unit race relations training, but racial harmony is never clearly defined.

Fourth, the more recent policy statements have begun to include goal statements concerning the elimination of discrimination which tended to be absent from earlier goal statements. Still, the policy statements tend to exhibit an almost schizophrenic character with respect to whether policy is oriented toward awareness or toward the elimination of discrimination. Within the same policy statement one can find substantial evidence in support of either view.

Fifth, the original policy on race relations/equal opportunity training and all subsequent modifications do not appear to have been based on any hard evidence that the training content and methods required could or would achieve the intended objectives.

Results of EO Training Assessment

The Army Research Institute, by contract with Human Sciences Research, Inc., conducted an Army-wide analysis and assessment of EO training in 1977. This work was reported in several separate research reports.[9] In general, these reports were heavily

[9] Robert L. Hiett and Peter G. Nordlie. *An Analysis of the Unit Race Relations Training Program in the U.S. Army.* ARI Technical Report TR-78-9B. Alexandria, Va.: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral Sciences, 1978.

William S. Edmonds and Peter G. Nordlie. *Analysis of Race Relations/Equal Opportunity Training in Korea.* McLean, Va.: Human Sciences Research, Inc., 1977.

Marcia A. Gilbert and Peter G. Nordlie. *An Analysis of Race Relations/Equal Opportunity Training in USAREUR.* ARI Technical Report, TR-78-B10. Alexandria, Va.: ARI, 1978.

Robert L. Hiett. *An Analysis of Experimental Race Relations/Equal Opportunity Training.* McLean, Va.: Human Sciences Research, Inc., 1977.

William S. Edmonds and Peter G. Nordlie, Human Sciences Research, Inc., and James A. Thomas, ARI. *Analysis of Individual Race Relations and Equal Opportunity Training in Army Schools.* ARI Technical Report, TR-78-B15. Alexandria, Va.: ARI, October 1978.

Byron G. Fiman, Ph.D. *An Analysis of the Training of Army Personnel at the Defense Race Relations Institute.* McLean, Va.: Human Sciences Research, Inc., 1977.

Peter G. Nordlie, Human Sciences Research, Inc., and James A. Thomas, ARI. *Analysis and Assessment of the Army Race Relations/Equal Opportunity Training Program: Summary Report of Conclusions and Recommendations.* ARI Technical Report, TR-78-B8. Alexandria, Va.: ARI, 1978.

critical of EO training being conducted in the schools and in the units. They concluded that less than half of the training which was required was actually being conducted and almost all of the training being conducted was of poor quality and not responsive to the Army's needs.

A key problem for EO unit training resulted from the 1974 revision of AR 600-42 which placed the responsibility for conducting unit training on the chain of command. This change placed responsibility for EO training in the hands of those having the least preparation in how to do it, and removing from the hands of those having maximum preparation—DRRI graduates who, for the most part, are now doing very little training. There was much evidence in the study that, as carried out by company commanders, unit training was a very low priority matter and largely a "paper program."

Still another critical issue is that, to the extent that EO unit training was reaching Army personnel, it was primarily at the level of E5 and below. It is definitely not reaching all levels, as the policy and doctrine intended and required. Thus, leaders—who by virtue of their role in the organization have the most power to effect change—are the least likely to participate in unit training.

In one part of the study, experimental EO unit training was established on three installations to test the effects of a number of specific variables on training effectiveness. The experiment was not entirely successful, primarily because of the uncertainty about how much of the experimental training actually occurred. But this outcome was important in itself because it suggested that if under ideal conditions, where everyone involved had been briefed and checked out, where lesson plans were provided, and where the company commanders involved knew their units were in the experiment and were going to be tested—if under these ideal conditions, the training still did not occur as required, then there must be something wrong with the basic concept on which Unit EO Training is built.

The Army's EO education and training program calls for training in Army schools as well as unit training in all units. Overall, there appears to have been far more emphasis on EO *unit* training than on *individual* training in the schools. It was concluded from the study of EO training in Army schools that on the whole, EO instruction was considered a low priority subject matter and was only reluctantly incorporated into course

curricula. At the time of the study, only a few of the schools had implemented the *Uniform Service School Standards for Race Relations/Equal Opportunity Instruction* which had been issued by TRADOC nine months previously. EO courses in the schools were generally not taught by EO-qualified instructors and the training was still largely oriented toward creating awareness. There had been little progress in tailoring training courses to specific job needs of students. Staff and faculty of schools tended to view EO training as an unwanted orphan thrust upon them—a low priority, directionless program. There is an increasing demand by school faculty and staffs to eliminate EO instruction given as a *block* of instruction and to split up the content and incorporate it into other blocks of instruction dealing with leadership and personnel. EO training in Army schools gives no evidence of being vigorously implemented by a coherent approach which faculty, staff, and students find meaningful and useful. This means that an important opportunity for individual education and training regarding many aspects of EO, especially as it concerns leaders, is being lost. With so little individual EO education and training occurring in the schools, the entire burden of EO training is by default laid on unit training, a task for which unit training alone is not equal. Most clearly, unit training is an appropriate locus for only some parts of the total EO education and training task. An effective EO education and training program will require a more balanced division of labor between school training and unit training.

Another conclusion from the study was that there is a need to rethink EO doctrine and to formulate a more comprehensive, coherent and articulated statement of doctrine which clearly interrelates the various components of the program. While the policy statement itself appears adequate, and the component program descriptions clear, there is no explicit concept of how they all tie together to achieve the policy goals. In other words, doctrine—which at any moment represents the best thought available as to *how* policy should be carried out--is inadequately formulated.

It was a conclusion from the study that most of the failings, problems and inadequacies of the EO education and training program stemmed directly from the fact that chain-of-command personnel have *not* been adequately prepared to carry out the responsibility with which they have been charged. The single greatest lack in the whole program has been the overall failure to educate and prepare Army leaders. Especially at the company commander level, with respect to their views of the EO program, Army leaders were characterized as being:

1. uncertain of the program's objectives;
2. distrustful of its intent:
3. unconvinced of its importance;
4. untrained with respect to its content; and
5. uncomfortable with the subject matter.

To the extent this characterization is accurate, it should help account for why the EO training may be less than fully effective in most instances and, indeed, in some instances, counterproductive. No matter what else is true of the program, until the chain of command is adequately prepared to carry out its EO responsibilities, the program cannot be expected to achieve its objectives. The single most important recommendation made in the study on how to make the EO program more effective was: *Prepare Army leaders to carry out their EO responsibilities and provide commanders with the tools they need to do it*—e.g., lesson plans, guidelines, unit diagnostic instruments, etc. Senior NCO's and senior officers are also the groups receiving the least EO training while possessing, as leaders, the greatest power to improve race relations and ensure equality of opportunity and treatment.

Desirable Characteristics of an EO Training Model

A major conclusion of the EO training assessment study was that a whole new approach to EO education and training should be developed and substituted for the existing approach. The new approach should provide a coherent, overall program which interrelates the training received at entry points, school training at various levels, and unit training. The study also identified a number of characteristics which would be desirable for such a model to have. These characteristics are listed below.

Leader Training—Primary emphasis in the program should be to effectively train Army leadership at all levels in awareness of their EO responsibilities and knowledge of how to carry them out.

Job Related—Training at every level should be geared to the jobs of persons at that level.

Progressive Training—Training received at one level or time should be reinforced and built upon by training at the next level or time.

Method of Instruction Appropriate to Content–Training methods should be related to content. Using small group seminars to impart essentially cognitive and factual information is as inappropriate as attempting experiential learning in a one hundred-person group.

Specific Objectives Clearly Established for Each Course–Each course should have specific, behavioral objectives.

Content Related to Training Objectives–Course content should be scrutinized to ensure that each part is necessary for the achievement of the training objectives.

New Content–New course content at many levels needs to be developed in order to meet new training needs regarding institutional discrimination, the issue of "reverse discrimination," the leader's role and responsibilities in the EO program, and the basic nature of the equal opportunity problem in the Army.

Greater Emphasis on Individual Training–The training program should be more balanced than it has been in that individual training in schools should better prepare students for the EO problems they will encounter in the field.

Elimination of Negative Aspects of Course Content–Course content should be scrutinized to eliminate aspects which tend to produce negative responses from students with no compensating positive effect. Past research has repeatedly found a need to make course content:

- less repetitious
- less black-white oriented
- more relevant to Army life
- less centered on minority history and culture
- more relevant to current unit problems
- less slanted to benefit minorities
- less blaming of whites.

Many such changes could be made without impairing the achievement of training objectives.

EO Training More Closely Tied to Affirmative Actions–The training program should be more explicitly related to and supportive of the Affirmative Actions component of the EO program. Heretofore, the components have been too unrelated and independent of each other.

Integral Feedback and Assessment System—The training program should have a built-in feedback and assessment system which provides a continuous assessment of the extent to which the program objectives are being achieved. Such a system should also be used to sense the need for changes in the program as a function of altered situations or the arising of new needs. This could provide a built-in mechanism for accomplishing adaptive change in the training program.

These would appear to be minimum characteristics which should be considered in developing a new approach to EO training. Such a new approach would not necessarily lead to an expanded program requiring any greater resources than the present one. One likely outcome is that a more effective program requiring substantially fewer resources than the present program may well be feasible.

The work described in this report is an effort to define these desirable characteristics in a rather concrete form. In a sense, the model proposed here is an ideal model which one would hope the Army would strive to achieve. Yet there are obvious constraints on funds and on human resources which might not allow the total fulfillment of the goals described here. Every effort has been made to describe "what the Army needs" while, at the same time, not being totally unrealistic about practical constraints on implementation of the model.

CHAPTER II
THE BASIC UNIFYING CONCEPT

In this chapter, we describe the unifying concept on which the overall EO training model is based. The description begins with an analysis of the objectives of EO training as specified in AR 600-21.

In the current regulations, a number of statements are made about the objectives of the total EO program and of EO education and training in particular. These statements emphasize:

- development of a healthy equal opportunity environment;
- eliminating discriminatory practices;
- developing maximum potential of all available talents and resources;
- fostering harmonious relations;
- eliminating the existence and the perceptions of the existence of personal and institutional discrimination.

Although stated in various ways, it is clear that if equality of opportunity is to be achieved, arbitrary, non-job relevant, discrimination must be identified and eliminated from the personal behavior of Army members and from the organizational practices of the Army. It is, therefore, to achieve that end that EO training is primarily directed. Seen in this light, the ultimate objective of EO training is to produce a *change* in personal and organizational behavior. If there are individuals in the Army who engage in discriminatory behavior which is harmful or demeaning to the victims, that behavior must no longer occur. If there are organizational practices which produce consistent, arbitrary discrimintory effects, then those practices must be identified and changed. The whole purpose of EO training, then, is to facilitate bringing such changes about.

The Linkage of Individual Training to Organizational Change

One key concept necessary to any full explication of a training model concerns the mechanism one assumes that relates individual training to organizational change. This is

especially true with respect to the elimination of institutional discrimination. In institutional discrimination, the source of discrimination is in the standards, rules, and procedures of the organization rather than in the intentional behavior of individuals. Members of the organization simply carrying out their jobs according to the rules as they understand them continue to perpetuate discrimination even when they are completely unaware of it and clearly personally do not intend it. How then can individual training result in organizational change?

The linkage assumed in the model developed here is through personnel decisions. Personnel decisions are made by individuals but they are made according to a set of organizational norms, rules, and procedures as understood and interpreted by the individual making the decision. If decisions are being made in an organization which can be shown to consistently favor one group of people at the expense of some other group, which groups differ only in non-job relevant characteristics like skin color, then one concludes that the norms, rules, and procedures for making that type of decision are discriminatory. If they are to change either they must be understood and interpreted differently in the future than they have been in the past or the norms, rules, and procedures themselves must be changed. In providing EO education and training to individuals one is essentially trying to sensitize and motivate them to see how and why the rules need to be applied differently than they have in the past or that they have to be changed themselves.

Thus to produce change in the way the organization functions, we first identify all the decisions which are made about people in the organization--promotions, awards, discipline, etc.- and then determine who makes each of them and where in the course of their education and training in the organization they received training in how to make such decisions. It is at these points where EO content needs to be introduced into the educational experience in order to ensure that people learn to make personnel decisions without inadvertent bias. If systematic, non-performance related bias can be eliminated from personnel decisions, the result will be the elimination of institutional discrimination. Personnel decisions, therefore, provide the linkage between the organization and the individual actor. The normal routine functioning of an organization can be modified by influencing the way personnel decisions are routinely made.

There are at least two general kinds of ways that personnel decisionmaking might be influenced. The first involves no change in the procedures or rules, but does involve sensitizing the decisionmaker to stereotypes, false assumptions, implicit values, and misperceptions he may have which, unknownst to him, may be biasing decisions he is sincerely trying to make impartially. The second involves sensitizing an individual who is responsible for

policy and procedures to be able to recognize when a policy or procedure which appears on the surface to be most impartial and unbiased actually produces systematically biased results. Such policies and procedures must be changed to eliminate the biasing element. EO training can create such awareness in individuals who through their actions can change the policies and procedures of the organization with the result of contributing to the elimination of arbitrary, non-job relevant discrimination.

It should be stressed that the only change in decisionmaking we are discussing is the elimination of arbitrary, non-performance related factors which systematically, albeit unintentionally, influence the outcome of the decision. Such changes should result not only in the elimination of institutional discrimination but also in objectively more valid decisions with an accompanying increase in organizational effectiveness.

The Objectives of EO Training

From this perspective, we have consolidated the various statements relating to EO training contained in AR 600-21 into three overall objectives:

- to eliminate personal discrimination within the Army;
- to eliminate institutional discrimination within the Army; and
- to effectively develop and conduct an EO program.

The training model has been developed under the assumption that these represent the ultimate objectives of all EO training in the Army.

This general-level statement of objectives is, of course, only a starting point. One criticism of Army EO education and training in the past has been that the objectives were stated in overly-general terms and were not based on expectations concerning *behavior*. Behavioral objectives represent an essential element of any new approach to this area. These behavioral objectives can be stated at any of several levels of detail, from very general to very specific.

The most specific level corresponds to what is described in TRADOC Pamphlet 350-30 as "terminal learning objectives (TLO)," "learning objectives (LO)," and "learning steps" in conjunction with Instructional Systems Development (ISD). This level is appropriate, in fact, encouraged, when one is developing a course of instruction for a specific job

or task. The job or task is analyzed into its component parts, and job performance measures (JPM) constructed. The TLO are based on these JPM and consist of an activity (behavior), a set of conditions under which the activity is to be performed, and a standard of performance which must be achieved if successful acquisition of learning is to be assumed. These are proximal measures of learning; i.e., measures amenable to a classroom setting (for testing information acquisition) and to simulation of on-the-job situations (for more performance oriented skills). They are substitutes for the more distal measures of learning; i.e., actual on-the-job performance.

The ISD approach to the development of instructional systems will be of some value in later stages of development of the EO education and training model. But there are several reasons why this specific and detailed level of objective is not presented in the model proposed here. The primary reason is that this is a *model* upon which a complete set of course curricula might be based, and not a curriculum *per se*. As each individual course, lesson, or block of instruction is developed, more specific behavioral objectives will be specified. The approach taken in describing the model has been to define *types* of behaviors which might be expected to be affected by EO education and training, rather than to name specific skills or behaviors. For example, personal discrimination is defined (Volume I, pages 21-23) as including: verbal discrimination, consisting of use of derogatory names or epithets, telling derogatory "jokes," expressing disrespect for others, and so forth; non-verbal discrimination which involves such behaviors as racially-motivated fights or arguments, voluntary self-separation, patronizing behavior, and others; and symbolic discrimination. Thus, for a lesson plan on personal discrimination as part of EO education in basic entry-level enlisted training, the TLO should include such statements as the following:

> Given a list of terms that might be used to address, describe or refer to an individual of Hispanic heritage, the student will be able to identify, without error, all those terms which most Hispanic individuals would consider to be derogatory.

The more distal objective, of the ultimate objective of education of this type, would be to eliminate the use by Army members of those terms which are derogatory or demeaning to a particular group.

Each of the three major components of the proposed model must ultimately result in some specific behavioral objectives. The model as presented here, however, only identifies generic classes of behavior to be affected, not specific behaviors for each target audience.

EO Education and Training Program Content

Based on the three global-level objectives named above, the decision was made that the model should be developed so as to respond as fully and as effectively as possible to those three issues: personal discrimination; institutional discrimination; and the effective operation of EO programs at all levels. The development of training content in each of these three areas is detailed below.

Personal Discrimination

Personal racism (or sexism) is defined in AR 600-21 in terms of "The acting out of prejudices by individuals against other individuals or groups because of race or gender" (p. A-1.). To elaborate on that definition we might add that personal discrimination is behavior which is meant to or has the effect of demeaning, degrading, or otherwise denigrating an individual or a group. Personal discrimination is the action of an individual toward another with the intent and/or the result that the target of the behavior is demeaned or degraded in some way. Analysis of the patterns of behavior of individuals that fall within this definition leads to the derivation of several categories or types of personal discrimination.

1. Verbal discrimination:

    a. Use of derogatory names or epithets;
    b. Perpetuation of sterotypes;
    c. Telling of derogatory stories of "jokes";
    d. Derogatory comments about the skills and abilities of specific groups;
    e. Derogation of the tastes, preferences, values and choices which result from cultural differences;
    f. Verbal displays of disrespect.

2. Non-verbal discrimination:

    a. Racially-motivated fights and arguments;
    b. Interracial crimes and harassment;
    c. Voluntary or enforced racial segregation or polarization;
    d. Patronizing and otherwise demeaning behavior.

3. Symbolic discrimination:

    a. Display of racist symbols in public places;

This listing of personal discriminatory behaviors is not exhaustive, but it is illustrative of the variety of forms that personal discrimination can take.

In order to address such behaviors in the model, some assumptions were made about why they occur and what can be done to eliminate them. Concerning the causes, two assumptions were made:

- These behaviors can occur because some people are naive or ignorant of the fact that the behaviors are negative and disruptive.

- These behaviors can occur because some people deliberately set out to demean, degrade, denigrate or avoid others because of prejudices.

These two assumptions open up a variety of education and training tactics which might serve to elicit behavior change. These tactics reduce to a very few with promise for success as part of the model. Among them are:

1. Inform all Army members as to what is and what is not acceptable behavior.

2. Inform all Army members concerning factors which might lead to negative interactions as a result of naive behavior; these factors include:

   a. lack of understanding of the nature of culture-based differences;

   b. lack of understanding of the basic concepts which create the impression of personal discrimination, e.g., stereotyping.

3. Educate all Army members about Army policy and the sanctions it prescribes for discriminatory actions as well as the channels it provides for resolution of complaints based on discrimination.

4. Encourage all Army members to respect the value and preferences of others and the dignity and worth of each individual.

5. Encourage Army leaders to set a behavioral example for their subordinates.

6. Educate Army leaders as to ways in which they can establish and enforce non-discriminatory behavior among their subordinates.

7. Enforce behavior standards with punishment for nonconformance, and publicize such punitive actions.

These tactics address both the unintended and the patently intentional forms of personal discrimination. They address the responsibilities of each individual for his or her own behavior as well as the responsibility of the leader for controlling the behavior of subordinates. They address both the voluntary and the externally enforced (policy) aspects of personal behavior. And they address both "awareness" and behavior change as objectives of training. They do not, however, have attitude change as an explicit objective.

Institutional Discrimination

The term institutional discrimination has become widely used in the Army to describe certain effects on people in organizations. These effects can be summarized as differences in treatment which:

- are associated with some physical or cultural characteristic (usually race or sex);
- result from the normal functioning of the organization; and
- operate to the consistent disadvantage of persons of a particular skin color (usually non-whites), or sex (usually women).

Institutional discrimination is recognized only by its effects, and not by the intentions of people in the organization.

Institutional discrimination can occur in an organization in a number of ways. It can result from:

- policies or procedures whose intent is to discriminate;
- policies or procedures which have the unintended *de facto* result of producing discriminatory effects;
- systematic bias in the interpretation of policies or the implementation of procedures which affect members of the organization.

Of these three sources, only the last two are appropriate targets of EO education and training efforts. There are already Federal laws and Army regulations which expressly prohibit the enactment of any intentionally discriminatory policy or procedure, and which have struck down any such policies or procedures which existed in the past.

In addition, the Army has already set about, as part of the Affirmative Actions component of the EO Program, to identify and eliminate any policies or procedures found to produce discrimination, albeit unintentionally. This is a continuous effort; every existing policy or procedure as well as every new one being considered must be carefully and constantly scrutinized for possible unintended discriminatory effects. Those Army members responsible for creating policy and for overseeing procedures must be fully aware of their responsibilities in this regard.

The most subtle and the most pervasive source of institutional discrimination has to do with personal biases which, either intentionally or totally without intent, can affect the decisions made by Army supervisors, leaders and managers in the day-to-day execution of their job-related responsibilities. Every day, in numerous ways, every Army member in a position of authority or responsibility makes decisions which impact the lives and careers of other members of the Army. These decisions range from a fire team leader in an infantry company deciding who will take what position on a patrol, to a field-grade officer on a selection board deciding who will receive a prestige assignment and who will not. All of these decisions are governed by policies and by procedural guidelines, yet each has some element of personal discretion which permits the decisionmaker to interpret and implement as he or she sees fit. The vast majority of these decisionmakers would vehemently deny that racial- or gender-related prejudices enter into their decisions. Yet the outcomes of those decisions over long periods of time demonstrate that there are systematic differences by race and by sex.

The main objective of EO education and training in regard to institutional discrimination, then, is to educate Army decisionmakers concerning the potential effects of their actions and to train them to analyze the decision process in such a way as to be able to reduce the likelihood of personal biases entering in. A secondary objective in this area is to educate junior enlisted personnel—those affected by, but not in control of, personnel decisions—as to their right to unbiased treatment under Army policy.

Administration of EO Programs

Chapter 4 of AR 600-21 provides a detailed description of the staffing and organization of equal opportunity programs. The introductory paragraph of this chapter, dealing with command responsibilities, states that:

> Commanders at all levels are responsible for the development and implementation of an Equal Opportunity Program for their organizations. In reality, the Commander is the Equal Opportunity Officer . . . .
>
> (AR 600-21, p. 4-1)

Clearly, then, a part of the total EO education and training model must be designed to enhance the abilities of Army leaders to understand what an EO program requires in the way of organization, resources, and support, and to administer such a program effectively. This is viewed as a necessary step to the achievement of readiness to perform the national defense mission.

Summary of Program Content Requirements

To reiterate, the framework within which the proposed EO education and training model was developed is provided by the three objectives of the total EO Program. The next step in the model's development involved the creation of a comprehensive plan for matching the general areas of content generated by these objectives with the specific needs of the various Army members at different levels and in different positions.

The Major Components of the Model

Once it was recognized that all of the content of the EO education and training model could be subsumed under the three topic areas described above, it was also recognized that each Army member is affected in some way by each of those topics. The relevance of each topic to any given Army member, however, changes as that individual's role in the Army changes, as a function of rank, seniority, duty assignment, career aspirations, stage of career development, and so forth. As an example, the treatment of personal discrimination as a topic for education and training will have a certain relevance to the basic trainee entering the Army from a farm or from a big city ghetto. The relevance of personal discrimination to a battalion commander, however, will be much different. In the former case, the basic trainee may have had extremely limited interracial contacts or contacts based on an adversary relationship. In the case of the battalion commander, a different background is assumed;

i.e., one in which some sophistication has been engendered in dealing with people of varied backgrounds. The basic trainee may practice personal discrimination or be a victim of it. The battalion commander has a mandate to avoid personal discrimination and to control its occurrence among unit members. There is no foreseeable way that a single block of EO education or training could suit the needs of both parties and of the Army equally well.

The same is true for institutional discrimination, wherein at any given time an Army member may be a decisionmaker at one level and the subject of a decision at another level. Likewise with an EO program in which every person is a potential beneficiary, but some of those same individuals have specific responsibilities for operations of the program at the same time.

The problem, then, becomes one of matching the specific needs of each potential target audience with the specific details of each of these content areas that are most relevant to members of that audience.

The solution to this problem has two dimensions. One of these has to do with identifying the possible settings within which EO education and training might occur, and the other with identifying the relevance of each topic to people at varying levels of authority and responsibility. The answer to the first of these established the basis for answering the second. Army training has traditionally been of three types:

- formal individual training in the Army's educational system;
- unit training; and
- individual training at the local level.

This was the structure adopted for the EO education and training model.

Individual Training in Army Service and Professional Schools

Development of this particular component of the model began by attempting to determine which Army members, as identified by rank or grade, made decisions or had responsibilities for other personnel which had implications for control of institutional discrimination, and where in the Army's education system they acquired the skills necessary to

execute those responsibilities. This matrix appears here as Figure 1. Closer examination of the matrix, however, led to the conclusion that it is redundant in the sense that the schools listed were, in effect, synonymous with the rank structure. In other words, only O-5's attend the Army War College, only E-9 candidates attend the Sergeants-Major Academy, etc. As a starting point, this matrix was adequate, but it was not totally sufficient to the development of the model. This matrix was, therefore, elaborated one further step; in effect, this step was a change in level of abstraction.

The net product was also a matrix, but with one axis representing the major formal schools and educational experiences provided within the Army's education system, and the other representing EO training content of potential relevance to attendees at those schools. Using this design, it was possible to identify which aspects of content were of actual relevance to attendees at each school, and to use that as a starting point for the development of detailed lesson plans. All such plans for a given school population, taken together, represent the EO curriculum for that school.

The same procedure was then applied to content relevant to personal discrimination and to the development of EO programs.

This component of the model is described in detail in Chapter III of this report.

Unit EO Training

Unit training in EO is qualitatively different from formal individual training in the schools. Whereas formal individual training is aimed at skill training to be applied to job responsibilities to be assumed upon completion of schooling, unit training follows more of an organizational development model in that its major benefit is in the identification and solution of problems being experienced within the unit. These problems are ordinarily surfaced by unit members and brought to the attention of unit leaders. These leaders then apply their management and leadership skills to the solution of those problems. Although this is not the only possible function of unit EO training—it can also serve a general educational purpose, and has been used primarily to that end in the past—it is the function upon which the Unit Training Component of the model places preeminent emphasis.

The approach to the Unit EO Training component of the model taken here is based upon a parallel development being pursued by Human Sciences Research, Inc., under an ARI contract. This effort seeks to develop a survey and supporting procedures and materials

Figure 1.

Matrix Describing Decisions Having EO Implications, Army Personnel Who Make Those Decisions, and the Place Where Training (If Any) Is Received As to How to Make the Decisions

Decisions	E-1	E-2	E-3	E-4	E-5	E-6	E-7	E-8	E-9	O-1	O-2	O-3	O-4	O-5	O-6	O-7	O-8	O-9	O-10
Assignment to command positions (battalion and above)														X	X				
DA General or Special Staff assignment				D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D							
Secretary of Defense or JCS Assignment																			
Promotion to Command Sergeant Major								X	X										
Aide-de Camp assignment																			
Attache duty assignment																			
Selection to senior service college															X	X	X		
Selection to Command and General Staff College															X	X	X		
Selection to Sergeants Major Academy								X	X										
Selection to NCOES basic course												X							
Selection to NCOES advanced course								X	X						X				
Selection to USMA*																			
Selection to OCS												X	X			X			
Selection to ROTC**																			
Dishonorable Discharge (enlisted)												AB	AB	AB	AB				
Bad Conduct Discharge (enlisted)										AB	AB	AB	AB	AB					
Undesirable Discharge (enlisted)										AB	AB	AB	AB	AB					

*Selection determined by Congressman.
**Attendance is voluntary.

CODE

X - Indicates that the personnel who make these de-decisions are not trained for this task.
A - Officer Basic Course
B - Officer Advanced Course
C - Quartermaster School
D - Army Personnel School
E - Recruiter/Counselor School

Decisions	E-1	E-2	E-3	E-4	E-5	E-6	E-7	E-8	E-9	O-1	O-2	O-3	O-4	O-5	O-6	O-7	O-8	O-9	O-10
Honorable Discharge (enlisted)												AB							
General Discharge (enlisted)												AB							
Honorable Discharge (officer)										X	X								
Less than Honorable (officer)																			
Non-judicial punishment										A	A	A	A	A					
Pre-trial confinement												X			X				
Administrative Discharge following pre-trial confinement																			
Summary courts-martial												X	X	X	X	X			
Special courts-martial												X	X	X	X	X			
General courts-martial												X	X	X	X	X			
Work assignments at unit level					X	X	X					X							
Utilization of DRRI/UDL personnel at unit level												X							
Utilization of DRRI/UDL personnel at brigade or higher levels												X	X	X					
On-post housing											X	X							
Off-post housing											X	X							
Distribution of Officers across occupational specialties					D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D							
Products at commissary												C	C	C	C				
Recreational facilities										X	X	X	X						
Awards and decorations										X	X	X	X	X	X				X
Enlisted Efficiency Report										X	X	X	X						
Officer Efficiency Report												X	X	X	X				
Selection for Ranger/Airborne training										X	X	X	X						
Selection for OETC												X	X						
Distribution of enlisted personnel across occupational specialties					D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D							
Receipt of qualification badges					X	X	X			X	X								

Decisions	E-1	E-2	E-3	E-4	E-5	E-6	E-7	E-8	E-9	O-1	O-2	O-3	O-4	O-5	O-6	O-7	O-8	O-9	O-10
Selection for GED program or high school										X	X	X							
Granting of waiver for promotion—time-in-service										X	X	X	X						
Granting of waivers for promotion—time-in-grade										X	X	X	X						
Bars to reenlistment												X	X	X	X				
AUS, eligible to reenlist					E	E	E												
First term RA, eligible to reenlist					E	E	E												
Career, eligible to reenlist								X		X	X	X							
AUS reenlisted					E	E	E												
First term RA, reenlisted					E	E	E												
Career reenlisted					E	E	E												
Personnel recruited					E	E	E												
Initiation of request for security clearance																			
Granting of security clearance																			
Additional duty assignments											A	A	A						
Selection for direct commission																			

NOTE: Most of the personnel who receive no formal training for a specific decision usually make these decisions based on "military judgment" or as per written procedural specifications. Note also that there is missing information for some of these decisions.

which can be employed by company-level commanders to diagnose unit EO problems. The survey results then can be translated into EO training priorities and a unit-specific training program (plus other actions) developed.

The Unit EO Training Component of the model is described in detail in Chapter IV.

EO Training for Unit Supervisors, Leaders and Managers

Once the decision had been made to proceed with an individual training component and a unit training component, the need for some type of "bridge" between the two was recognized. On the one hand, formal school training provides a framework within which the Army leader can at least recognize his or her EO responsibilities, at a generic level. On the other hand, Unit EO Training provides a very unique situation within which the leader must apply that generic training. Any two students in the NCO Advanced Course or the Command and General Staff College might leave those institutions and move on to two totally different assignments with drastically different responsibilities having decidedly different EO implications. That is, they may be called upon to apply their newly-acquired EO knowledge in quite different ways. EO Training for Unit Supervisors, Leaders and Managers is seen as one appropriate forum for Army leaders at a particular installation to spend a short period of time, under professional guidance, determining how to apply the *general-level skills and knowledge* acquired in an Army school to the *particular responsibilities* of a specified duty assignment on a day-to-day basis.

EO Training for Unit Supervisors, Leaders and Managers is described in Chapter V of this report.

Summary

Development of the proposed Model for EO Training in the Army, then, proceeded from an analysis of Army EO policy to a statement of EO training objectives. These objectives were translated to content requirements in three areas: personal discrimination, institutional discrimination; and the operation of EO programs. It was then determined what relevance each of these areas has for Army members at various levels of authority and responsibility, and what was the most appropriate forum for EO education and training to occur for each group of Army members. Three major components of the model were created:

- Individual EO Training in Army Schools;
- Unit EO Training; and
- EO Training for Unit Supervisors, Leaders and Managers.

These three components form the overarching framework for the model. Detailed descriptions of proposed training content, audiences and methods within these three components are provided in the next three chapters.

CHAPTER III

INDIVIDUAL EO TRAINING IN ARMY SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

The largest and most far-reaching of the three principal components of the Comprehensive EO Training Model is that which has to do with EO education and training in the Army's formal educational and career development system for noncommissioned, warrant and commissioned officers. Current Army regulations require that "Education for noncommissioned officers and officers will consist of formal instruction given at NCOES, NCO Academy, Officer Advanced courses and the Command and General Staff College, and any other leadership and development courses." (AR 600-21, p. 3-1.) While the necessity for leader training in EO has been recognized in policy, however, the quality of this training has not always been as high as one would expect. The results of a recent analysis of EO training in the service and professional schools were described in Chapter I. They indicated that, although the requirement for this type of training exists, and there is considerable agreement that it is important, there is little to indicate that the training given is of any real value to the Army. The individual training model proposed here is an effort to overcome the shortcomings of current EO training for Army leaders by establishing a comprehensive, interlocking set of objectives, by defining content to be included in the schools' programs and by designing a system which links all of an individual's separate EO education experiences into a comprehensive pattern of knowledge applicable to job responsibilities.

The ideal model for any type of training for Army leaders is one which takes a career perspective as well as addressing the specific needs of the leader at any particular stages in a career. In other words, a longitudinal, as well as a cross-sectional, approach is needed. Another desirable characteristic of such a model is that it relate the training provided to leaders at one level to that provided to leaders at other levels with whom the leader will be called upon to work. Thus, not only should the EO training content provided to an E-5 candidate be prefatory and related to that provided an E-7 candidate, so that the same individual has proper preparation when reaching the E-7 level, but the training provided to company-level NCO's should be directly related to

that provided to company grade officers, and that for Sergeants-Major directly related to the training of senior officers. The Individual EO Training Component of the comprehensive model attempts to provide that vertical and longitudinal continuity.

Objectives

The overall objective of Individual Training in the Schools is to eliminate both personal and institutional discrimination through leader actions. This global goal can be broken out into the following more specific objectives:

1. To provide each Army leader with a career-long set of EO education and training experience to enable him or her to:

    a. detect and eliminate personal discrimination;

    b. detect and eliminate institutional discrimination;

    c. establish and administer an effective EO Program as required by regulation.

2. To relate EO education and training to the general and specific job duties and responsibilities which occur at the various levels of leadership; emphasizing EO as an element of effective management of resources.

Each component, each element, each module within the total model also has a highly specific set of objectives which are defined for a particular school population and a particular type of course content. Appendix X to this report provides detailed lesson objectives for a number of training modules to be included in the Individual EO Training Component of the model.

Target Audiences

The target audience for individual training for leaders is a large one, made up of every supervisor, leader and manager in the Army, including noncommissioned, warrant

and commissioned officers. Each school within the Army's education and career development system, of course, represents a separate target audience for a specific component of the training. Those schools which have been identified for inclusion in the individual training component of the model are listed in Table 1. It should be noted that education process begins immediately upon entry into the Army for the enlisted soldier and at the earliest possible time for officers under this model.

Training Content

In this component of the training model, training content must be discussed on several different dimensions. There are three major divisions in program content, including:

1. Training aimed at the elimination of personal discrimination in all Army activities.

    a. Training aimed at modifying individual behavior;

    b. Training for leaders in controlling personal discrimination among subordinates.

2. Training aimed at the elimination of institutional discrimination in all Army activities.

3. Training to enable leaders to develop and administer Equal Opportunity Programs as required.

Within each of these areas a distinction must be drawn between what might be called "awareness training" and job-related training. The specific elements of each of these that is dealt with will vary from one school to another as will the proportion of time devoted to one or the other. For example, at the Basic Training level for enlisted volunteers, a large proportion of awareness training is required to prepare them to operate in a racially- and culturally-mixed co-educational unit and in an Army made up of individuals from quite diverse backgrounds. In the Advanced NCO Course, by contrast, awareness training might be rather minimal, stressing perhaps, the possible role

Table 1

Army Schools Included in the Individual Training Component of the Model

A. Enlisted Schools

1. Basic Training
2. Advanced Individual Training
3. Primary NCO Course
4. Basic NCO Course
5. Advanced NCO Course
6. Senior NCO Course
7. Sergeants Major Academy

B. Warrant Officer Schools

1. Warrant Officer Candidate Course
2. Warrant Officer Pre-Appointment Course
3. Warrant Officer Post-Appointment Course
4. Warrant Officer Senior Course

C. Commissioned Officer Schools

1. Officer Candidate Course
2. Reserve Officer Training Course
3. U.S. Military Academy
4. Officer Basic Course
5. Officer Advanced Course
6. Command and General Staff College
7. Army War College
8. New General Officer Orientation Course

of cultural differences in shaping the approach taken by a supervisor to decisions which affect subordinates. For the senior NCO, however, training related to the specific decisions that are made on a day-to-day basis, and how these decisions impact on the total unit and Army-wide presence or absence of institutional discrimination, would occupy a large proportion of training time.

Recognizing that these differences in emphasis will occur as a function of the particular target audience, and that the level of detail of training will differ for the different levels and types of responsibility, the elements of content included as "awareness" and "job-related" training are summarized in Table 3.

Training Methods

The broad range of target audiences and the extremely wide range of program content opens this element to virtually all of the available training methods, technologies and approaches outlined in Chapter V of Volume II of this report. Each module in each school must be attended to separately so that an appropriate match is made among audience, content and method. Some general guidelines are recommended below:

1. Coverage of the basic objectives of Army EO policy might best be provided by means of a brief film in which high-ranking Army officials, The Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff of the Army, for example, outline clearly what is expected of Army members in regard to behavioral standards.

2. At the basic training level, the training and education must be made as persuasive as possible within a format which acquires and maintains student attention and takes as positive a view as possible; all of this must be done in a style suitable to a relatively unsophisticated audience. Perhaps new films on awareness should be developed and pilot-tested for effectiveness.

3. The more advanced the level of the target audience, the more reliance should be put on such training approaches as realistic exercises in problem solving, group discussion, simulations, case histories, and self-instruction through outside readings and programmed instruction, using readily available training technologies.

Table 2

Training Content to be Included in Awareness and Job-Related Training

Awareness Training

A. Cognitive

1. Policy
2. Facts about various cultures
3. Historical background of EO
4. Role of women in Army and society
5. Understanding basic concepts fundamental to an understanding of EO
   a. prejudice
   b. institutional discrimination
   c. personal discrimination
   d. stereotypes
   e. affirmative action
   f. reverse discrimination
6. Understanding the relationship between beliefs and decisions
7. Enumeration of areas where institutional discrimination can occur
8. Individual rights and responsibilities
9. Use of statistics in diagnosing institutional discrimination
10. Recognizing the effects of discrimination on mission effectiveness

B. Belief/Attitude/Perception

1. Training to counter stereotypes and other undesirable beliefs
2. Effects of perceptions and beliefs on behavior

C. Behavior-Oriented Training

1. Defining acceptable and unacceptable behavior
   a. verbal (epithets, jokes, sexist language, etc.)
   b. non-verbal
2. Role of perceptions in interpreting another's behavior
3. Value of a personal behavioral example
4. Peer pressure and its effects on behavior

Job-Related Training

A. **Training Aimed at Reducing Personal Discrimination**

1. Army policy on personal discrimination
2. Establishing standards of conduct for the unit
3. Enforcing standards of conduct
4. Defining sanctions for violation of standards
5. Setting a personal behavioral example
6. Diagnosing unit climate on racism/sexism issues
   a. unit survey
   b. informal feedback
   c. personal observation
7. Developing solutions to problems of personal discrimination
   a. counseling
   b. training for unit
   c. training for chain of command
   d. modification of policies, procedures

B. **Training Aimed at Eliminating Institutional Discrimination**

1. Recognizing institutional discrimination and how it affects the organization and the individual
2. Recognizing the role of the leader in eliminating institutional discrimination
3. Decisions which may result in institutional discrimination
4. Enumeration of decision areas to which the leader has input
5. Defining the leader's input to each type of decision
6. Defining rules for non-discriminatory decision making

C. **Training Aimed at Development and Administration of an EO Program**

1. Understanding Army EO objectives
2. Establishing local EO objectives
   a. for training
   b. for affirmative actions
3. Identifying resources (E/T and AA)
   a. in the unit
   b. outside the unit
4. Staffing an EO Program
5. Defining staff responsibilities
6. Defining proper communication channels
7. Establishing a record-keeping system
8. Establishing procedures for handling of complaints
9. Publicizing the program
10. Development of Affirmative Actions Plans

4. The tendency demonstrated in the past in some modules on EO in the service schools has been to portray EO as "nothing more than good leadership." While this, in itself, is not incorrect or inherently undesirable, it has resulted in the tendency of some leaders to ignore racial aspects of "leadership situations" where discrimination should have been the diagnosed problem cause; often leaders have passed off racial problems as "personality conflicts," "drunken brawls" or "just another barracks fight," rather than attending to the real underlying cause. This approach should be discouraged.

5. Undue repetition should be avoided from one module to that taught in the next school in a career sequence. Repetition and reinforcement of the key concepts must occur, but to the extent it is necessary it should be done as subtly as possible. One of the most common criticisms of past efforts at EO education and training has been its boring and overly repetitive nature.

Beyond these few generalizations, there is little to be said at this time, at a detailed level, about training methods in this component of the model other than that a tailored approach is necessary to maximize the desired impacts on the particular target audience. This is the task of those charged with development of the programs of instruction in support of the model.

Delivery of Training

In the past, instruction on EO in the service and professional schools often has not been taught by persons trained at the DRRI. As a result, an instructor is expected to provide his or her students, many of whom are unconvinced of the relevance of EO, with a block of four or more hours of instruction on a very important and sensitive issue, with no special preparation other than reviewing the lesson plans provided. Little wonder that the training was, at best, marginally successful when one considers that DRRI provides 16 weeks of instruction for its students to prepare them for EO assignments, some of which include platform instruction, group facilitation, structured exercises, and so forth.

It is imperative that the instructors who will provide training in the schools under the proposed model have special preparation for the task. Equal opportunity is too important a subject to be left to instructors who are no more sensitive to EO issues nor any more advanced in their thinking on the subject than their students. If equipment maintenance were taught by instructors no better prepared than their students, the

Army would not function at anywhere near full effectiveness. Yet with a topic so fundamental to the human performance aspect of mission effectiveness as EO, little thought is given to the level of sophistication of instructors. Unfortunately, it is only after an individual has undergone an experience like that at DRRI that he or she realizes how ill-prepared he/she was to instruct in this area before the experience.

It is recommended that all persons expected to conduct formal EO education and training courses be given DRRI or equivalent training. This does certainly, have clear implications for selection criteria for attendance at DRRI; it also might call for a rethinking of the Army curriculum at the Institute, and the objectives of DRRI training as a whole.

Assessment of Training

The general philosophy of and rationale for the evaluation of EO training throughout all elements of the training model is described in Chapter VII. A few words should be said about the application of that approach to this component of the model.

There are two important elements to the assessment process, evaluation of the training process and assessment of the impacts the training has on students and on the Army in the long term. Feedback from both elements of the assessment process can provide useful information in modifying the training program.

Process Evaluation

Every experienced educator or trainer with a serious interest in the quality of instruction will make an effort, however informally, to assess the process by which the training is conducted. In a relatively complex situation involving multi-modal instruction with group discussion, structured exercises and other approaches as well as lecture, this becomes an important part of the program. When, as in the proposed model, a master training program is being implemented by local personnel who have little control over program content and methods, process evaluation has limited applications. Nonetheless, it is important that it be done, if only to bring about refinement and "fine tuning" of the program, without major structural changes. Local process evaluation, then, might focus on the flow of particular segments of the program, looking for ways to avoid "dead

spots" that have been encountered, or developing a smoother team approach to particular elements of training. This can be accomplished by self-criticism by instructors and, in part, through student critiques.

Process evaluation should also be performed at higher echelons. The Training and Doctrine Command, for example, might want to look at all situations in which a particular block or module of instruction is being implemented and draw some conclusions concerning the adequacy of the recommended approach. For example, if a similar or identical block is being presented in several schools, instructor critiques should be accumulated over time with the objective of assessing whether or not the instructors feel comfortable and confident that the recommended approach is appropriate, or if another might be better. The same is true for training content. If there is general agreement that the content is slightly off target for a particular audience, but that required changes are more than one would expect to be made as local refinements, TRADOC will want to be aware of that fact as well.

Impact Assessment

It is possible for the training process to be palatable, even enjoyable, without having any of the desired impacts on a long-term basis. It is important, therefore, that both immediate and long-term impacts be assessed. Questions such as the following must be asked and answered:

- Are the learning objectives being achieved?
- Is student behavior changed as a result of training?
- If change is detected, how long does it last?
- Is the overall status of discrimination in the Army changing in the desired direction?

To some extent, the immediate effects can be assessed by achievement tests administered before and after training, or by attitude and opinion surveys. The analysis of short-term changes in knowledge and beliefs, however, can be rather complex and require sophisticated statistical tests in order to be meaningful. Behavior change is much more

difficult to measure because of the problems associated with self-reports of behavior, lack of opportunity to practice the desired behaviors, and the expense of more sophisticated behavior observation techniques.

In a sense, it is easier to detect long-term change in the total Army than to detect either short-term change or changes at the individual level. Longitudinal studies of the knowledge and beliefs (attitudes, perceptions, etc.) of program graduates should be undertaken. Army-wide surveys on EO topics should, over time, reflect a general trend in the desired direction. Finally, statistical indicators of the presence or absence of institutional discrimination should show systematic change over time. These long-term assessment techniques should be built into a total evaluation design, both for research purposes and for purposes of more immediate feedback to instructors and to *those in charge of program modifications.* It must be kept in mind, however, that the farther the impact measure occurs from the time of training, the more difficult it is to attribute the effects observed to the training.

Additional Considerations

There are some factors unique to this component of the training model which must be considered. For one thing, not all types of EO instruction can be fitted cleanly into an existing school. There are selection boards, for example, at various levels and composed of a wide variety of members. The questions must be raised as to whether the more appropriate approach is to include some coverage of board membership aspects of EO in every school attended by potential members, or to have a special EO orientation for various types of board members, or perhaps both.

Another consideration revolves around special schools such as training for recruiters. Recruiters play a crucial role in conveying to potential volunteers an image of the Army. It is, therefore, important that they be aware of the EO implications of their job-related and social behaviors. Army lawyers and judges are in a similar situation with regard to the EO implications of their professional behaviors.

In response to these considerations, a list of these "special concern" decision areas has been prepared. It appears in Table 4. Note that the general principles of good, unbiased, discrimination-free decisionmaking apply in all of these cases. Those principles will be covered adequately in school-based training. In addition, some of the decisions are specifically job-related and their unique EO aspects will be adequately

Table 3

Decision Areas Not Related to Specific Schools But Requiring EO Training

1. Recruiting-related decisions
   a. Policy decisions
   b. Individual recruiter decisions

2. Selection for career-enhancing training
   a. Assignment to MOS
   b. Leadership training
   c. Technical training
   d. Ranger, Airborne, other special training
   e. Special schooling, e.g., DRRI, OETC
   f. Senior service school selection

3. Promotion decisions
   a. Local boards
   b. Central boards

4. Selection for career-enhancing assignments
   a. Command and staff assignments
   b. Prestige assignments (e.g., attache, White House Fellow, etc.)
   c. Development of selection criteria
5. Judicial decisions
   a. Type of trial
   b. Nature of sentence

6. Housing referral and management decisions
   a. Placing landlords who discriminate off limits
   b. Assignments to quarters when quality of housing varies

7. Club management decisions
   a. Employee selection
   b. Choosing entertainment
   c. Menu selection
   d. Scheduling of special events

covered in "unit leader training," a separate aspect of the training model. Yet there are some decisions, especially those involving board membership for selection purposes, which are important enough to warrant a special plan for EO orientation of individuals assigned to special duty or to temporary assignments of this nature. This "special orientation for selection board members" must also be a part of the individual training component of the model.

Summary

In the past, a number of serious criticisms have been raised concerning the quality of equal opportunity instruction in the Army's service and professional schools. The Individual EO Training Component of the Army EO Training Model is designed to remedy the problems now being experienced and to provide a comprehensive approach to career-long training of soldiers and leaders in the Army.

CHAPTER IV
THE UNIT TRAINING COMPONENT

The second major component of the comprehensive Equal Opportunity Training Model is the Unit Training Component. The entire concept of unit training for Army personnel is of fundamental importance in maintaining a combat-ready Army. This is true not only of those directly mission-related types of training which have to do with the performance of MOS-specific tasks in combat and combat support units, it is equally true of other types of unit training which have traditionally been viewed by many as "not related to the mission." These include unit training sessions devoted to such topics as safety, "character guidance," drug and alcohol abuse, and the UCMJ, as well as equal opportunity. The unit cannot function at full effectiveness if significant portions of its personnel are in the hospital as a result of holiday traffic accidents, in jail or in a detox center as a result of substance abuse, angry at each other over racial discrimination or sexism, or dissatisfied with the chain of command because of institutional forms of race or sex discrimination. It is not enough that each member of each unit *know how* to perform his or her mission. Each member must be present, motivated, and psychologically and physically prepared to perform the mission, both as an individual and as a member of a team, if the unit is to achieve its full mission-directed potential. Unit training in matters related to EO helps serve these purposes, and is, therefore, essential to readiness and effectiveness.

There are other specific reasons why unit training in equal opportunity matters is of value to the unit and the Army. One of these reasons is that most members of the Army are assigned to integral units of one kind or another. There are, of course, exceptions, such as recruiters and military attaches whose relationship to an active Army unit is a tenuous, administrative one, at best. But for that vast majority of Army members who are part of active units, what happens to them "in the unit" is often perceived by them as "what happens in the Army." As a result, most of the problems which will arise with regard to either personal or institutional forms of discrimination will arise in the context of "the unit" and are ordinarily first addressed to the chain of command of the unit wherein the problem occurs. For this reason, unit-specific education and training aimed at preventing EO-related problems is essential.

Another factor in favor of unit EO training is that, without it there would be large gaps in the sequence of EO training experiences for Army members. Without unit EO training, the junior enlisted member of the Army would not ordinarily come into contact with EO education and training from the time of the initial basic training experience until the first formal EO instruction encountered in the NCOES.[10] Similarly for leaders, both enlisted and officer, the Army cannot afford to have too long a hiatus between EO education and training experiences, since the entire concept of institutional discrimination ultimately falls back on the decisions made by leaders, whether those decisions be policy decisions at DA level or decisions concerning who gets what detail on a given day in the company-level unit.

Finally, it is essential to the presence of a high level of morale in the unit that unit leaders have a forum in which to hear what the problems are that unit members are experiencing, so that those problems can be addressed by those who can do something about them—the leaders themselves. In the area of EO, a unit training session provides that forum. It is certainly not the only mechanism for achieving the goal of communication, but by virtue of its being an officially-sanctioned forum for discussion of EO matters, it can successfully be used to elicit statements and awareness of issues which would not be raised or noticed otherwise.

Before proceeding to a detailed discussion of the Unit Training Component of the model, a few words of explanation may be required about the specific use of the words "unit" and "training" in this context.

The use of the word "unit" here is rather loose in one sense. One often thinks of unit training as occurring in line combat units. A much broader use of that term is intended here. Although basically we are referring to a company, troop, battery, or detachment, the term "unit" is not meant to exclude any other size of organization which ordinarily conducts individual or collective training for its members. By this is meant such organization as the finance section of a large AG Company, for example. The definition of "unit" that is implied here is meant to coincide with the definition commonly in use in referring to unit training, without excluding the possibility of EO training being conducted in even smaller sections where that is feasible.

[10]There are exceptions to this, among them the USAREUR policy of providing an EO orientation course to all new arrivals in the Command.

In a technical sense, the term "training" should be used to include only those events and experiences of the individual whose objective is to increase job skills. The unit training rubric is used to encompass much more than that, however, as described earlier. The term is used here for two reasons: it corresponds with the policy statements, and with popular usage; and the training contributes to unit performance.

Objectives of the Unit Training Component

Historically, the objectives of Army race relations and equal opportunity (RR/EO) training have been phrased in terms related to racial harmony and, more recently, the eradication of discrimination. The most recent statement of objectives (AR 600-21, 20 June 1977) states the following:

> "D-1. Objectives. a. The general objective of the Army Equal Opportunity Program is to support and reinforce the goals of establishing and maintaining harmonious personal and group relationships among all Army personnel and eliminating both the existence and the perception of the existence of personal and institutional discrimination.
>
> "b. There are four specific learning objectives.
>
> "(1) To facilitate and improve the soldier's understanding of the entire Equal Opportunity Program for the United States Army.
>
> "(2) To inform unit members about potential sources of minority/gender dissatisfaction and interracial/intersexual tension in the Army and about what the Army is doing to remove any grounds for dissatisfaction and tension in specific areas.
>
> "(3) To increase the soldier's understanding and acceptance of different cultural modes.
>
> "(4) To provide the chain of command with contemporary information and feedback on the status and progress of the Equal Opportunity Program." (page D-1.)

The general objective (Para. a.) might be stated somewhat more simply. It can be argued that "harmonious personal and group relationships," at least insofar as the EO regulation pertains, would result from eliminating discrimination. The general-level objectives of the Program might be stated somewhat more succinctly, then, as follows:

> The general objective of the Army Equal Opportunity Program is to eliminate from the Army all forms of arbitrary discrimination, both personal and institutional.

The specific learning objectives (Para. b.) associated with Unit EO Training, while they are desirable goals, do not begin to cover all the possible areas that might be dealt with in the unit training context. At one level, the information-conveying aspect of unit training is recognized ("to inform," "to increase understanding," "to provide information"), but the real potential value of unit training would seem to lie outside the realm of the mere disbursement of information of the types described. The entire aspect of identifying and solving EO-related problems experienced by unit members is left out of consideration in these statements of "learning objectives."

The entire concept of Unit EO Training as it is proposed in this model revolves around the problem-solving process. The information-passing function is seen as either a means to diagnose or solve problems in the unit or as a means to prevent the occurrence of problems when none are currently identifiable. The process involves setting specific objectives only after a specific problem or other topic of training has been identified. The process is described in detail below.

The Problem Identification and Resolution Process

Whether one refers to the process of identifying and attempting to solve problems in an organization as the OD (or OE) model, the organizational intervention model, or simply the problem-solving model, it is a common-sense approach to the improvement of any organization's operations. It is not the property of any specific school or discipline, and there is no magic to it. Any organization can use it and it can benefit any organization if used well. The process can be described in general terms as having four steps: problem diagnosis; design of an intervention to solve the problem; implementation of the intervention; and assessment of results. In the present context, we are dealing with problems which are EO-related; the Army unit as the organization; and unit EO training as the intervention (although numerous other interventions might be equally or more applicable for any specific problem identified).

Problem Diagnosis

The basis for Unit EO Training in this model lies in a determination, for each unit, of what the EO problems are that unit members feel they have. Training (as well as certain other actions) follows from the identification of those problems. The unit commander is charged with that responsibility by AR 600-21:

> "**D-2. Guidelines for establishing and maintaining a Unit Equal Opportunity Program.** a. Unit commanders are responsible for ensuring that each organization has a relevant and viable Equal Opportunity education and training component. The MACOM commander will establish minimum education and training requirements for subordinate organizations consistent with command needs and local conditions. However, the content and development of local programs is left up to individual commanders.
>
> "b. The following guidelines/suggestions are provided to assist commanders in determining the appropriate training criteria best suited for their individual units.
>
> "(1) Determine the level of awareness and the degree of knowledge of Equal Opportunity of personnel currently assigned to the organization.
>
> "(2) Select the best method of training based on the results of the initial survey of basic needs.
>
> "(3) Once the commander determines the topic and method of presentation, the instructor/project officer/NCO is selected; and the time and training sites are established and confirmed.
>
> "(4) Finally, the commander will assure that the training is scheduled and attendance is mandatory for all unit personnel. Adequate compliance monitoring procedures must be implemented to assure quality of training and maximum participation of all members of the command, without exceptions."

It is logical that the commander should be responsible for EO training in the unit as for other types of unit training. But this need not mean that the commander must or should, as an individual, carry out all of these steps. The responsiblities may be delegated to others in the unit; for example, the first sergeant, a Unit Discussion Leader (UDL); also, a primary duty EO staff member at brigade or higher level might be called on for assistance.

There are numerous ways in which this diagnosis can take place. Diagnostic methods might include: a survey of unit members by means of a questionnaire; a "race relations council"; selective interviewing by an "outsider"; an anonymous complaint-processing procedure (suggestion box); or just through careful attention to what unit members are saying and doing, as observed by members of the chain of command. All of these methods should be employed simultaneously, as should any other method which tends to open the channels of communication from top to bottom and back.

The idea of organizational surveys has been used successfully in organizational problem diagnosis efforts in private industry as well as in government. A system of survey-based diagnosis of EO-related problems in Army units is currently under development by the Army Research Institute. This is the prototype system upon which the Unit Training Component of this model is predicated. The survey allows for detection of potential problems in the general areas of: personal and institutional discrimination (race or sex) in the unit; personal and institutional discrimination elsewhere in the military community; personal and institutional discrimination in the local civilian community; and feelings of "reverse discrimination" on the part of whites and males. At a generic level, these are the major areas in which unit-level complaints of an EO nature might be expected. Each area subdivides into several discrete issues, of course.

The survey is administered to all unit members. Results are tabulated by computer, and a report is fed back to the unit commander, with each of several areas of race and sex discrimination listed in priority order, from worst to best. The results are tabulated in such a way that comparisons can be made between races, between men and women, and across several groupings by rank. The commander may choose to interpret the results alone or to call on others for assistance in doing so. This survey represents the most complete, systematic and formal way of diagnosing unit EO problems that is available, and is recommended as the main source of diagnostic data.

The other methods of acquiring information listed above should also be employed. The survey does have limitations. For example, the survey diagnostic method is only practical if used infrequently. The number of personnel hours required to administer and interpret the survey limits its use probably to no more often than twice a year. Another drawback is that the survey, while useful for detecting problems which affect large proportions of people in the unit, is not useful for detecting problems

more limited in scope, i.e., affecting only one or a very few people. As a result, the more idiosyncratic methods of problem detection should also be used. But they must be used in an *active* manner. If the chain of command sits back waiting for problems to be brought to their attention, the information may well not come to them in time to prevent problems or to catch them at an early stage. The chain of command must actively attend to all kinds of verbal and non-verbal signs if the problem diagnosis phase is to lead to adequate remedial measures, whether through unit training or some other means.

Design of Problem-Specific Training

The Unit Training Component of the model is the only component which requires tailoring of training for specified audiences based on problems specific to those audiences at any given time. The other components include tailored training, based on stable sets of conditions and responsibilities. As a result, the Unit Training Component is a more dynamic element of the model. This places an even greater burden of responsibility on the unit commander, and forces even further reliance by the commander on EO specialists for assistance.

The dynamic (changing) elements of this component include, in addition to the problem being addressed, the particular target audience, the instructional technique to be employed, and the identity of the individual delegated the responsibility for conducting a particular training session. Each of these is addressed below.

Target Audiences

Within the Army unit, there are several identifiable groups which, either separately or in various combinations, will comprise the audiences to whom EO training in the unit is addressed. The exact composition of the total audience for any particular training session will be largely a function of the training subject. The most convenient and widely applicable dimension for identifying these audiences is rank or grade. The potential audiences, then, will be made up of:

- Junior enlisted personnel, E1 through E4;
- Junior NCOs, E5 through E6;
- Senior NCOs, E7 through E9;

- Company grade officers; and
- Field grade officers.

Each of these groups will have minority and majority group members and men and (where applicable) women. The leader groups might be further subdivided into those who are directly in the chain of command and those who provide staff support to the chain of command. With regard to field grade officers, it should be made clear that they, too, are to participate in Unit EO Training as necessary, whether that participation be in the role of leader (e.g., a battalion commander attending a session in A Company) or in the role of "unit member" (e.g., a battalion commander attending a session within HHC).

It is a current requirement of AR 600-21 that members of the unit chain of command actively participate in unit EO training sessions "as instructors, discussion leaders, or as resource persons for answering questions concerning policy and practices" (para. 3-4.c.(1), page 3-2). The importance of leader participation cannot be overstated. One of the most serious and widespread criticisms by junior enlisted personnel of Unit EO Training has been that leaders do not attend the sessions, much less participate. This appears to relate directly to the perception most leaders at company level seem to have that the sole objective of Army EO training in units is to reduce personal discrimination, especially inter-racial fights, at the junior enlisted levels. This view totally ignores institutional discrimination which is at least as important to the Army as is personal discrimination and which is largely a result of the actions of company-level leaders in implementing Army policy and in making decisions which affect soldiers' careers, directly or indirectly.

To counteract this incorrect impression that many company-level leaders (as well as leaders at other levels) have, the Unit Training Component of the model stresses that both personal and institutional discrimination are legitimate, even necessary, topics for Unit EO Training, and that training may be specifically addressed, at any given time, to unit *leaders* as well as to the junior enlisted soldier. Leader participation, then, may be of two types: as an instructor or resource person when personal discrimination is the topic being addressed; or as a member of a designated target audience when institutional discrimination is being addressed, especially the role of leadership in eliminating institutional discrimination.

Training Session Content

The problem areas most likely to be raised in the Unit EO Training context are those described earlier as being included in the diagnostic survey. These include problems related to both personal and institutional aspects of discrimination, including both race and sex discrimination, in the unit, outside the unit on post, and off post in the civilian community. Obviously, this includes most of the possible problem areas to be addressed in unit training. But the task of designing a training session or program to resolve any of these types of problems is not a simple one. Eventually it should be possible to provide the unit commander with guidance and with specific recommended approaches to be used in dealing with particular problem areas. At present, that guidance is not available and the commander is left to use his or her best available resources to design training around identified problems.

It is recommended that lesson outlines and, to the extent possible, complete programs of instruction be developed to address the following areas, at a minimum:

1. Personal racism in the unit.

   a. Verbal behavior by unit members including, but not limited to:
      (1) use of derogatory remarks;
      (2) telling of racially demeaning jokes;
      (3) insults about characteristics of other racial groups;
      (4) insults about professional abilities of other groups;
      (5) insults about preferences of other groups for food, clothing, music, etc.
      (6) reference to derogatory stereotypes.

   b. Non-verbal discrimination including, but not limited to:
      (1) racial separation during duty hours;
      (2) racial separation during off-duty hours;
      (3) demeaning or inflammatory posters, cartoons, slogans posted in quarters or duty areas;
      (4) inter-racial arguments, fights, harassment or intimidation.

2. Personal sexism in the unit

   a. Verbal behavior by unit members including, but not limited to:
      (1) derogatory or demeaning names;
      (2) derogatory or demeaning jokes;
      (3) insults about women's abilities to perform their jobs;
      (4) use of sexual innuendo in a professional context;
      (5) reference to derogatory stereotypes.

b. Non-verbal behavior by unit members including, but not limited to:
   (1) unwanted sexual advances;
   (2) patronizing behavior;
   (3) sexual intimidation by leaders.

3. Institutional race discrimination in the unit.

   a. Discrimination in favorable personnel actions including, but not limited to:
      (1) duty assignments and details;
      (2) recommendations for promotion;
      (3) recommendations for career-enhancing training;
      (4) recommendations for awards, decorations, etc.;
      (5) passes, leave, time off for personal business.

   b. Discrimination in unfavorable personnel actions including, but not limited to:
      (1) non-judicial punishment;
      (2) extra duty assignments;
      (3) treatment under the UCMJ;
      (4) differential enforcement of regulations.
      (5) use of counseling to modify undesirable behaviors.

   c. "Reverse race discrimination" in any of the above areas.

4. Institutional sex discrimination in the unit.

   a. Discrimination in favorable personnel actions including, but not limited to:
      (1) duty assignments and details;
      (2) recommendations for promotion;
      (3) recommendations for career-enhancing training;
      (4) recommendations for awards, decorations, etc.;
      (5) passes, leave, time off for personal business.

   b. Discrimination in unfavorable personnel actions including, but not limited to:
      (1) non-judicial punishment;
      (2) extra duty assignments;
      (3) treatment under the UCMJ;
      (4) differential enforcement of regulations.

5. Race or sex discrimination outside the unit, on post.

   a. Personal discrimination including, but not limited to:

(1) treatment by DA civilian employees in housing, personnel, finance sections;
(2) treatment received from MP's;
(3) treatment received in PX, Commissary, etc.;
(4) treatment received by service club personnel.

b. Institutional discrimination including, but not limited to:
(1) non-availability of special products in PX or Commissary;
(2) differential housing assignments;
(3) lack of special-appeal music and entertainment in service clubs.

6. Race or sex discrimination in the civilian community including, but not limited to treatment received from:

a. rental agents and landlords;

b. merchants;

c. people in personal service businesses;

d. police;

e. other government representatives;

f. neighbors;

g. local school personnel.

In addition, it is recommended that materials be developed to support Unit EO Training in certain areas not directly related to raising and resolving problems, but areas which are, in themselves, valuable in preventing the occurrence of EO problems where none have been detected. In other words, Unit EO Training should not be ignored simply because there are no apparent problems in the unit. These would include:

7. Supplementary Unit EO Training topics.

a. awareness of the nature and intrinsic value of cultural diversity;

b. cross-cultural communication and understanding;

c. DOD, Army and unit EO policy;

d. role of women in today's Army;

e. the nature and inherent dangers of stereotyping;

f. complaint-processing procedures;

g. the relationship of EO to unit effectiveness.

Some of the materials described above are presently available in some form. There should be an effort to upgrade those which are available and to make high quality materials on these and other selected topics readily available Army-wide.

Program Design

Perhaps one of the weakest elements of Unit EO Training as a "commander's program" is that, at the company level, resources for the design of a training session are very scarce. As a result, many commanders virtually ignore EO training altogether; others see to it that training is conducted, but often the sessions which are presented are not well-prepared nor are they presented in such a manner as to be productive or to achieve specific goals. As a result, the commander is able to pass an IG inspection because training was done, but the end product pleases no one, and may well be a "negative motivator" for some.

There are several partial solutions to the problem of shortage of resources. One of these is the approach suggested above, wherein training materials on specific subjects would be made readily available throughout the Army. A second partial solution would be to upgrade both the selection criteria and the quality and quantity of training provided to Unit Discussion Leaders at company level. Still a third partial solution lies in educating the unit commander as to the many resources which are currently available and as to the most effective way to make use of them. This last suggestion is an integral part of the Leader and Manager Training Component of the model. A final potential solution would be, of course, to increase the resources available locally, by adding more primary duty OOU personnel and/or assigning them to lower echelons than is being done now. This does not appear likely to happen, however, in view of the Army's problems in recruiting and maintaining adequate numbers of highly qualified and motivated personnel, problems which are likely to increase in the near term as the population of "qualified military available" personnel shrinks.

At present, a unit's training program must be put together under the assumption of limited resources. If the commander is to be responsible for the quality of training, an element must be built into the total training model which provides that commander with guidance on program design, as was stated above. But at the present time,

the Unit Discussion Leader, working with the consultation of primary duty EO staff at brigade or higher level, seems the most useful resource at the commander's disposal, and commanders must come to recognize the value of the UDL.

In designing a training session, the UDL must be sensitive to and aware of a number of issues, including: the nature of the problem to be addressed; the defining of objectives for the session; the variety of training techniques available and appropriate to both the topic and the audience; and the identification of professional specialists who might be available to assist in implementing the training. Each of these elements and considerations will play a role in the decision process, as each individual session takes shape within the context of an entire training program for a designated time period.

Implementing the Training

The delivery system within the Unit Training Component of the model has two elements: methods and personnel. The two interact with each other and with the training topic and audience, as is true for other components of the model. The unique feature of the Unit Training Component is that the decisions as to how these matches are to be made are more or less *ad hoc* decisions made by local personnel rather than pre-planned "packages" inserted into a school or other formal structure. It is not the intent of this chapter, therefore, to go into great detail as to what *should* be done for any particular training topic. Rather, it will be reiterated that a wide variety of training methods is available and that conditions specific to a unit training session will dictate which of those approaches will be used and who will be charged with implemeting the training.

It should also be reiterated, of course, that there must be active involvement on the part of the unit's leadership, even when they are not directly responsible for executing the training, e.g., as instructor, facilitator or discussion leader.

The complexities of the Unit Training Component make it absolutely necessary that Unit Discussion Leader Courses provide UDLs with a strong background in all the above-named areas—diagnosis, interpretation, planning, resource management, platform instruction and facilitation, etc.--if the program is to succeed in achieving its objectives.

Assessing the Results of Training

Here again, the Unit Training Component differs from the more formal school-based instruction in terms of the assessment of training impacts. In concept, this assessment should be easier in the Unit Training Component than in the Individual Training Component because there is the opportunity in the unit for long-term follow-up to assess results. There are, however, the drawbacks related to limited resources and *ad hoc* objectives in the units, not to mention personnel turbulence both in and outside the chain of command. Nevertheless, it is important that such an assessment be undertaken.

The evaluation process in the unit should be considered as having two components, a process evaluation component and an impact assessment component. The former has to do with the perceptions of training session participants and other observers concerning the adequacy of the session for addressing the stated topic and the quality of its implementation. Impact assessment would rely more on the perceptions of those involved as to whether the stated objectives for the session being evaluated have been achieved.

Methods available for process evaluation include critique sheets from the target audience(s) as well as from others present as observers, and a post-mortem examination, including the commander (or commander's designated representative), the UDL, and any other knowledgeable parties.

M[illegible] for impact assessment include those described as applicable to problem dia[illegible] [illegible]ow-up survey, active listening, etc. In addition, some individual should [illegible] [illegible]nsible for thoroughly investigating the aftermath of the training [illegible] [illegible]d, bad, or mixed, and reporting back to the commander and/or dis[illegible]

Summary

This chapter has attempted to describe the Unit Training Component of the Comprehensive EO Training Model. The elements of this component are summarized below:

- **Overall objective:** To eliminate both personal and institutional discrimination from the unit.

- **Specific objectives:** Objectives for specific unit EO training sessions will be defined on an *ad hoc* basis, depending on the topic or problem area being addressed.

- **Overall approach:** Unit EO training consists of a four-step process of:

  1. Problem diagnosis
  2. Training program design
  3. Implementation of training
  4. Follow-up assessment of process and impacts

- **Target audiences:** Unit members can be subdivided into five groups, based on rank or grade; any one or more of these groups might be a target audience for a given topic. The groups are:

  1. Junior enlisted (E1-E4)
  2. Junior NCO (E5-E6)
  3. Senior NCO (E7-E9)
  4. Company grade officers
  5. Field grade officers

- **Problem diagnosis methods:** Unit-specific problems may be identified through a variety of formal and informal methods, including:

  1. a Unit Diagnostic Survey;
  2. an Equal Opportunity Council;
  3. active efforts by the chain of command to detect incipient problems, through verbal and non-verbal behavioral signs;
  4. informal conversations and interviews; and
  5. generally keeping vertical communication channels open.

- **Content of Unit EO Training:** Specific training content for each session will be determined by the problem diagnosis process. Generic categories of content for Unit EO Training are listed below (and on pages 57-59, with examples):

  1. Personal race and sex discrimination in the unit.
  2. Institutional race and sex discrimination in the unit.
  3. Personal race and sex discrimination on post, outside the unit.
  4. Institutional race and sex discrimination on post outside the unit.
  5. Race and sex discrimination in the off-post civilian community.
  6. Supplementary topics to generate and increase awareness of EO subject matter as it pertains to unit life.

- Training methods: Any of the methods described in Volume II may be applicable to Unit EO Training. The best method for each session will be determined by a variety of local conditions and circumstances, including:

  1. the particular training topic;
  2. the time available for preparation;
  3. the personnel and other resources available;
  4. the particular target audience.

- Delivery component: The unit commander is personally responsible for Unit EO Training and must make the best possible use of available resources. Chief among those resources is the Unit Discussion Leader.

- Assessment component: The Unit Training Component should be evaluated in terms of both process and impacts. Each individual session should be evaluated as follows:

  1. Process evaluation by means of:
     a. participant critique sheets;
     b. a post-mortem by knowledgeable observers.

  2. Impact assessment by means of:
     a. any of the problem diagnosis methods described above;
     b. specific follow-up of results as compared to the specific objectives established prior to the session.

- Additional recommendations: It is also recommended that:

  1. Unit Discussion Leader selection criteria be made more stringent, since this is the chief resource the commander has and is likely to have in the future;
  2. UDL training be upgraded in quality, and content be modified to include the use of the Unit Diagnostic Survey;
  3. training materials be developed on each of the general and specific subject areas outlined on pages 55-58;
  4. these training materials be made widely available to unit commanders;
  5. training received by unit commanders include coverage of the Unit Training Component and the commander's role in it; and
  6. training received by all present and future members of the unit chain of command emphasize the institutional component of discrimination and the leader's role in eliminating it.

CHAPTER V

THE SUPERVISOR, LEADER AND MANAGER TRAINING COMPONENT

The third of the three major elements of the Comprehensive EO Training Model is the Supervisor, Leader and Manager (SLM) Training Component. This component is designed to provide every Army member in a position of authority, from the first-line supervisor to the MACOM commander, with an education or training experience which relates the EO principles learned in the Individual Training Component to the immediate, job-related responsibilities of the leader. The rationale for leader training was described earlier, in detail. At this point, it will be reiterated that leaders perform several functions with regard to EO in the Army: they set a behavioral example for their followers; they are responsible for the elimination of personal discrimination within the scope of their authority; they are responsible for the decisions which determine whether or not institutional discrimination exists within the scope of their authority; and, at certain levels, they are responsible for the smooth and effective functioning of the EO Program. For these reasons, it is essential that supervisors, leaders and managers at all levels be kept constantly aware of their roles and responsibilities in connection with EO.

The SLM Training Component has been designed to take maximum advantage of certain ongoing EO activities and to provide some additional experiences to enhance the leader's capabilities for handling EO responsibilities. This component has two subparts: (1) company-level chain of command training; and (2) executive seminars. These are reinforced and supported by two routine command activities, the orientation for new leaders and the commander's staff conference.

Each of these elements is discussed in detail below.

Unit Leader Training

The SLM Training Component has the same overall objectives as does the Army's EO Program as a whole, that is:

- To eliminate personal discrimination; and
- To eliminate institutional discrimination.

The objectives of the Unit Leader Training element which relate to these overall goals are:

1. To relate prior EO education and training experiences to current job responsibilities.

2. To make leaders aware of their roles and responsibilities in Army efforts to eliminate discrimination.

3. To enhance the ability of the unit chain of command to work as a team in eliminating discrimination.

The mechanism for achieving these goals is a brief refresher training session for unit leaders, occurring only once for any one individual while assigned to a specific unit.

Target Audience

The intended audience for the unit leader training element includes all members of any given unit who have some level of input to decisions which affect the working life of some other member of the Army. This effect might be either an immediate effect in day-to-day unit operations or a longer-range effect with career implications. This would seem to include everyone from the first-line supervisor on up to the unit's top leader or commander.

This definition of the target audience is relatively easy to work with when one considers a typical line unit, but questions arise when other types of units are considered. Consider, for example, the difference between an E-5 fire team leader in an infantry squad as compared to an E-5 personnel records handler in an AG company. The fire team leader has responsibility for the performance of all members of the team. If a team member fails in his duties or violates a regulation or commits some other infraction, the team leader has the authority to initiate disciplinary proceedings. The other E-5, in contrast, might not have specific supervisory responsibilities, but may have some impact on the accuracy of personnel records and the speed with which they are processed, transferred, etc. The latter soldier is not in the unit's chain of command, but does have responsibilities which can affect another individual's career. Both soldiers have responsibilities with direct EO implications, where the potential for bias exists. Do both get EO training under the SLM Training Component?

The answer, obviously, is "Yes." But this answer has important implications for how the total training package is put together. Care must be taken to insure that decisionmakers in all types of units are included, and that training program content takes account of the broad variations in job responsibilities for persons in the same grade in different types of positions and units as well as persons in different grades in the same unit.

The language used in the description of unit leader training which appears below reflects a bias toward the traditional TOE unit. This is done simply because it is very cumbersome to reiterate the model for various types of units. The reader is reminded that this is an artifact and is not meant to exclude other types of units from consideration.

Training Content

The content of Unit Leader Training can be subdivided into two components, an awareness component and a job-specific component.

Awareness Training

Much of the EO education and training that has been done in the Army has been of the type designed to generate in the participant an awareness of the nature and effects of discrimination and the need to work toward elimination of all forms of discrimination. Much of the criticism of the Army's program has been addressed to the point that "awareness training" often "raises more questions than it answers," "dwells on ancient history," blames the white majority of today for the transgressions of their ancestors, and repeats the same fundamental message over and over again. (A large part of this criticism might more justifiably be directed specifically at the training methods often employed and perhaps at the quality of that training.)

Nevertheless, awareness of the phenomenon of discrimination is essential to the ability of the Army leader to relate his or her specific responsibilities to that phenomenon. The role of awareness training in the Unit Leader Training context, then, has several aspects, including:

1. Strengthening the existing awareness of Army leaders concerning the facts about personal and institutional discrimination, i.e., what these terms mean, how the phenomena occur, what effects they have, and what the current status of discrimination is in the Army today, in policy and in reality.

2. Reiterating the basic message concerning cultural diversity in the Army, i.e., that there is considerable diversity, that diversity is not bad in itself, that an effective leader cannot ignore culture-based differences in judging the behavior of subordinates, etc.

3. Reiterating the basic message concerning the changing roles of women in our society and in the Army in particular.

4. Creating or strengthening leaders' awareness of the role of the leader in the Army's EO Program.

The intent in including these specific awareness objectives is not to retrace all of the historical materials concerning discrimination nor to go into vast amounts of detail about the black culture, the Latino culture, the Asian culture, and so forth. Neither is it to arouse feelings of guilt. Rather, it is to put into focus for the leader the implications of all of these things for effective and unbiased performance of leadership responsibilities in today's Army.

Job-Related Training

Awareness of the issues described above is important, but not sufficient in and of itself. There needs to be a process of translating these abstract principles to a concrete reality in terms of practical implications for the leader on the job. This is the function of the second type of content in Unit Leader Training. This job-related training will have the following objectives:

1. To enable each unit leader to define each type of decision he or she participates in and the exact nature of that participation, i.e., initiation or recommendation, participation as a member of a group (board, panel, council, etc.), approval or denial of recommendations initiated by others, or total control over the decision.

2. To enable each unit leader to identify the possible discriminatory results of each of those decision inputs.

3. To enable each unit leader to identify all possible ways in which personal and institutional bias might enter into the decision processes identified above.

4. To enable each unit leader to identify methods for detecting and preventing personal and institutional bias from entering into the decision processes.

5. To enable each unit leader to define his or her role in a discrimination-free decision process, as a member of the leadership team.

Content of the job-related training experience will be oriented around this set of objectives.

Training Methods

The assumption is that relatively limited time will be available for Unit Leader Training of the type described here, probably not more than a single work day or the greater part of one day, say six to eight hours. This limits the types of training approaches that might be used. The following recommendations are made.

For awareness training of the type described above, it is recommended that the main teaching techniques be: lecture, with ample use of illustrations and examples; group discussion, guided by an experienced facilitator using a pre-planned set of objectives; and role-playing by unit leaders, under instruction from the facilitator and using standardized role descriptions as guidance. Simulation of actual job contexts would also be appropriate here. Self-study through video tapes and vignettes is another applicable approach. Additional readings might be suggested for acquiring further detail on the practical implications of cultural difference. Brief handouts on relevant topics would be even more valuable. A list of other references including available films, possibly for use in a unit training session, would also be very useful.

The instructional approaches recommended for inclusion in the job-related portion of Unit Leader Training are: lecture, particularly for content such as the current status of indicators of discrimination and other factual information; small group task assignments for identifying responsiblities and their EO implications, with groups made up of persons with similar responsibilities; group discussion of the results of the task-oriented work sessions; and structured exercises based on the discriminatory potential of the decision-making process, with guidance by an experienced facilitator.

The Delivery Component

The importance of Unit Leader Training and the complexity of the content involved make it essential that the training be conducted by persons especially prepared for that task. Under current conditions, that would mean graduates of the Defense Race Relations Institute (DRRI) would be provided with the applicable training materials and would be responsible for acquiring the specific content knowledge and applying their training skills and experience to the implementation of training. Once standardized materials have been developed for this type of training, it would be desirable to have skill-upgrading training, on a centralized or regional basis, for selected DRRI graduates of each installation. They, in turn, could serve as trainers for local personnel who do not attend that training.

Assessment of Training

Evaluation of the Unit Leader Training should be done at two levels, local and MACOM. Local trainers can conduct periodic process evaluations, based on participant critique sheets and self-criticism. Impacts of Unit Leader Training will be less easy to assess, because the desired outcomes are behaviors which are difficult to observe systematically. These behaviors do, however, get reflected in statistical reports and in the number of formal complaints filed, in the long run. They might also be assessed through unit EO surveys.

Evaluation from the MACOM level should be done periodically for quality control purposes. Spot monitoring of training and of training records and checks of installation statistical reports (e.g., FORSCOM 57-R) are probably the most useful data sources for this purpose.

Anticipated Problems

Three potential problem areas should be addressed in relation to Unit Leader Training. Two have to do with scheduling and the third with resource limitations, specifically, the availability of qualified trainers.

With regard to scheduling, one potential problem has to do with insuring that individual unit leaders receive the training at a time when it will be of greatest benefit to them. If the leader attends training too soon after entering the unit, that person may not be familiar enough with his or her duties and responsibilities to be able to relate the training to the job. At the other extreme, the leader who knows the job well may be scheduled for rotation out of the unit before the effects of training can be realized. In this case, everyone loses—the Army, the leader, and the unit. There is no pat answer to this problem, other than to say that the training should be scheduled frequently enough to avoid any extensive delay in receiving the training and that each individual participant should be attended to as a separate case, optimizing on scheduling. As a goal, each leader should attend training within, at most, eight weeks after accepting a new assignment.

The other scheduling problem has to do with unit scheduling. It would be valuable if all the leaders from a single unit could participate in the training experience at the same time, as a team, to achieve maximum benefit from the training. Unfortunately, it is not possible to take all the leaders out of a unit for a full day and expect that unit to function effectively. Nor would it be practical to have the training take place in the unit area, because of the inevitable interruptions and because of the resulting need for more trainers.

The best compromise solution would seem to be to have a centralized training schedule within a brigade-size unit, with each leader from a specified company-size unit scheduled in response to mission-related and other constraints (e.g., time in unit, see above), but with as many members as possible of the same unit attending the same session.

The third problem, that of adequate numbers of qualified personnel to conduct the required training, is a very real one in most locations, but not one which can be solved here. We can only recommend that Army-wide needs for EO staff personnel to conduct local leader training be studied, and that the implications be examined for the numbers of persons selected to attend DRRI.

Executive Seminars

The objectives of the Executive Seminar element of the SLM Training Component of the model are:

a. To relate prior EO education and training experiences to current job responsibilities.

b. To make senior leaders and managers aware of the role of policy in eliminating discrimination.

c. To make senior leaders aware of the importance of high-level command support to the success of the Army EO Program and to increase that support.

Target Audience

The recommended participants for Equal Opportunity Executive Seminars include, at Division level:

- the Division Commander;
- the Division Commander's principal staff officers;
- the Command Sergeant Major;
- all commanders and Sergeant Majors of brigades and brigade-equivalent units.

Seminars are also recommended at MACOM level, where they would include:

- the MACOM Commander;
- the MACOM Commander's principal staff;
- the Command Sergeant Major;
- all Division Commanders in the MACOM and their Command Sergeants Major.

Training Content

There is room for considerable variability in the specific topics to be addressed at any given Executive Seminar. Topics might include: consideration of the EO implications of MACOM or installation policies; possible improvements in the EO Program; the Affirmative Action Plan; consideration of the indicators of discrimination and of racial climate; command initiatives in supporting the EO Program; specific problem areas

identified as requiring immediate attention, etc. Whatever the topic, however, it is recommended that each seminar begin with a current status report on EO in the Division/MACOM and end with a list of specific actions to be undertaken, with suspense dates and persons responsible, so that a report can be presented at the ensuing Executive Seminar.

It should always be kept in mind that the objectives of the Executive Seminar are related to the role of policy and the implementation of policy by senior leaders in the total context of the EO Program, but that this does not limit discussion and deliberation to EO policy *per se*. Rather, the EO implications of all policies should be considered. Every seminar should be related to those objectives.

Training Methods and Trainer Personnel

A variety of approaches to Executive Seminars have proven successful in the past. The approach used most frequently has consisted of presentations by guest speakers. Also of value have been workshop sessions in which specific problem areas have been identified and solutions worked out by participants during the seminars. Other approaches might involve the analysis and interpretation of statistical reports and/or results of surveys on EO-related matters.

Heavy reliance on a lecture format does not seem advisable for target audiences such as these. To the extent that a speaker does address an issue, there should also be allowances for question and answer periods, for group discussions, and for realistic exercises or group tasks based on the subject material. Perhaps the most valuable resource in this setting is the combined experience and expertise of a large group of senior leaders and managers. There should be present, to provide specialized EO expertise and guidance to the discussion, a qualified, DRRI-trained officer or experienced and senior NCO, or an outside resource person with equivalent background.

Assessment of Executive Seminars

If an Executive Seminar is planned well, if specific objectives are set, and if a plan of action (as described above) results from the seminar, the evaluation of outcomes will consist of following up on the plan to see that it is implemented successfully. Process evaluation, by means of participant critiques and self-criticism by EO specialists, will also be of value.

Additional Elements

Even with the two major elements described above, there are some undesirable gaps in coverage of EO content for supervisors, leaders and managers. For example, there is no provision for company and battalion commanders to interact formally on EO matters with their brigade commander. Fortunately, there are two relatively standard activities which can help remedy the gaps which do exist, and their use for this purpose is strongly recommended.

One of these is the commander/staff conference which most leaders at brigade-equivalent level conduct in order to maintain communication with subordinate unit commanders. This forum might well be used to discuss the results of an Executive Seminar attended by the senior member of the command. Or it might be used for a discussion of the local Unit Leader Training, and its implications for the entire chain of command (or leadership structure). Another possibility is that specific policies and procedures might be examined from an EO perspective.

It is recommended that at least a single hour every four to six monthes be devoted to the discussion of EO matters. Here again, it is recommended that a knowledgeable and experienced EO specialist be present, either as a facilitator, if that is the format, or as a resource person.

The second routine activity which can be used productively for EO purposes, and often is, is the orientation briefing for new commanders. If used properly, this session presents an opportunity to acquaint the new commander with job-related aspects of EO specific to his or her unit, and to describe the leader training that is available. Guidelines for running an EO program should also be presented at this time, as well as a rundown of the EO resources to which the commander has access. It should be recognized that, at most major installations, this already occurs, although the format varies widely as does the quality.

Summary

The Supervisor, Leader and Manager (SLM) Training Component of the Comprehensive EO Training Model has two major elements, described in summary form below.

Unit Leader Training

- Objectives:

  1. To relate prior EO education and training experiences to current job responsibilities.

  2. To make leaders aware of their roles and responsibilities in Army efforts to eliminate discrimination.

  3. To enhance the ability of the unit chain of command to work as a team in eliminating discrimination.

  4. To relate EO to unit morale and to mission readiness and performance.

- **Target Audience:** All leaders in company-equivalent units or work groups who have some input to decisions which affect other soldiers' working lives or careers, in the short or long term.

- **Training Content:** This module has two types of content, described below:

  1. **Awareness training,** whose objectives are to strengthen leader awareness of:

     a. the concepts of personal and institutional discrimination;
     b. cultural diversity in the Army;
     c. the changing roles of women in society and in the Army; and
     d. the role of the leader in the Army's EO Program.

  2. **Job-related training,** whose objectives are:

     a. to enable each unit leader to define each type of decision he or she participates in and the exact nature of that participation, i.e., initiation or recommendation, participation as a member of a group (board, panel, council, etc.), approval or denial or recommendations initiated by others, or total control over the decision.

     b. to enable each unit leader to identify the possible discriminatory results of each of those decision inputs.

     c. to enable each unit leader to identify all possible ways in which personal and institutional bias might enter into the decision processes identified above.

d. To enable each unit leader to identify methods for detecting and preventing personal and institutional bias from entering into the decision processes.

e. to enable each unit leader to define his or her role in a discrimination free decision process, as a member of the leadership team.

- **Training Methods:** Recommended methods include: lecture; guided group discussion; structured exercises; role playing; task-oriented work groups, each tailored to specific items of content.

- **Delivery Component:** Training will be delivered by DRRI-trained instructors.

- **Assessment:**

  1. Process evaluation , through student critiques and instructor self-criticism.

  2. Impact evaluation, through analysis of statistical reports, unit surveys.

- **Potential Problem Areas:**

  1. Scheduling of individual participants for training to maximize the impact on the individual and the unit.

  2. Scheduling of unit "teams" to be minimally disruptive to unit operations.

  3. Probable shortage of qualified instructors.

Executive Seminars

- **Objectives:**

  1. To relate prior EO education and training experiences to current job responsibilities.

2. To make senior leaders and managers aware of the role of policy in eliminating discrimination.

3. To make senior leaders aware of the importance of high-level command support to the success of the Army EO Program and to increase that support.

- Target Audiences:

  1. Division level

     a. The Division Commander.

     b. The Division Commander's principal staff officers.

     c. The Command Sergeant-Major

     d. All commanders and sergeants-major of brigades and brigade-equivalent units.

  2. MACOM level

     a. The MACOM Commander.

     b. The MACOM Commander's principal staff.

     c. The Command Sergeant-Major.

     d. All Division Commanders in the MACOM and their Command Sergeants-Major.

- **Training Content**: Variable, but with emphasis on:

  1. current status reports;

  2. EO implications of policy;

  3. command support for EO.

- **Training Methods and Personnel**: A variety of combinations, including presentations by guest speakers, workshop problem solving sessions, guided discussions, with the participation, but not necessarily control, of a qualified EO specialist.

- Assessment:

  1. Process evaluation through participant critiques and self-criticism.

  2. Impact assessment by follow-up of established plan of action, including goals, tasks, timetables, and responsible individuals.

Additional Considerations

The Unit Leader Training and Executive Seminars should be closely tied in with orientation briefings for new commanders and with command and staff meetings at brigade-equivalent level.

CHAPTER VI
DELIVERY OF EO EDUCATION AND TRAINING

In the preceding chapters, the delivery system recommended for each component of the total model has been described. It has been recommended that Individual EO Training in Army Schools be conducted by DRRI graduates. The same is true for both Unit Supervisor, Leader and Manager Training and Executive Seminars. Unit EO Training, on the other hand, is the job of the unit chain of command, actively supported by Unit Discussion Leaders and by DRRI graduates at brigade or higher level, as needed. These recommendations have obvious implications for the nature of training provided by DRRI and for Unit Discussion Leader Courses. A discussion of some of these implications follows.

Implications of the Model for DRRI Training

If the Defense Race Relations Institute is to remain the sole source of MOS-preparatory training for equal opportunity staff personnel, and there is no apparent reason to assume that it will not, the concept of the total training model must be brought into the DRRI curriculum. Although there has been, in the past, some difference of opinion and some lack of clarity as to whether part of the DRRI mission is to train EO instructors and trainers, if the recommended training model is adopted it will be necessary to make that a specific, explicit objective of the DRRI program. Four aspects of the model which have important implications for the DRRI curriculum are:

- the total concept of a comprehensive training model and its component parts;
- use of the unit diagnostic survey as an EO training tool; and
- the need for upgraded UDL training.

The Comprehensive Model

The most current information available at the time of this writing[11] concerning the content of the DRRI program of instruction does not indicate that the subject of

[11]DRRI Class List, received December 1978.

school-based Army EO training is dealt with at all in that POI. It is assumed, therefore, that the curriculum does not deal directly with the concept, let alone the detailed content, of formal training in Army service and professional schools as a comprehensive and long-term endeavor to eliminate personal and institutional discrimination through education and training of Army leaders. Neither does DRRI training appear to deal with the other major components of the proposed model, Unit EO Training and Unit Leader Training. If the Individual Training Component is to come anywhere close to achieving its maximum potential effectiveness, it must be conducted by skilled, well-trained trainers. This creates the requirement that DRRI (Army) students be made aware of the approach to be taken, the methods to be employed, the content to be presented, and the means for assessment and feedback to be carried out in the implementation of formal training.

It is specifically recommended that the following revisions to the POI at the Institute be considered:

1. Introduce a block of instruction which describes the model.

2. Insure that each student is familiar with all of the content to be included in the school-based and local leader training and with the rationale for that content.

3. Insure that each student is familiar with the instructional methods to be employed in school-based and local leader training.

4. Insure that each student is familiar with the need for continuing assessment and feedback to upgrade the training experiences and with the procedures for conducting that assessment and feedback process.

The Unit EO Diagnosis and Assessment System (TDAS)

A key element of the Unit EO Training component of the model is problem diagnosis, followed by problem-solving actions. A unit EO diagnostic survey can be a very important part of that process. Such a survey is currently under development by the Army Research Institute. This survey, the Unit EO Diagnosis and Assessment System, has been field-tested with some success and will soon be ready for implementation on a broader basis. It is essential, then, that local EO staff members, particularly those with primary duty in

EO at the brigade and higher levels, be familiar with that system. This familiarity must be intimate enough that they not only understand and can operate the system themselves, but also that they can incorporate some form of orientation briefing for unit leaders on the use of the system and can provide a somewhat more extensive treatment on the system as part of the design and implementation of UDL training. It is recommended that the DRRI program for Army personnel be amended to:

- Include detailed knowledge of the potential use of the diagnostic survey as a unit training tool.

Preparation for UDL Training

It is obvious that, if the Unit Discussion Leader is to become more prominent in the Unit EO Training process, UDL training must be modified. Because UDL training is designed and conducted by DRRI graduates, it is recommended that DRRI training:

- Include instruction on the implications of the comprehensive EO training model for design and conduct of UDL training courses, including the selection of UDL candidates.

Implications of the Model for UDL Training

At several points in the discussion of the Unit EO Training component of the model, mention was made of the potential role of the Unit Discussion Leader (UDL) in implementing that component of the model and the EO Program at company level, in general. The Unit Discussion Leader program has been in effect in the Army for several years now, and has come under criticism from two important perspectives; that of the unit commander and that of the Equal Opportunity staff.

The UDL program comes under criticism from commanders in several aspects. Certain commander criticisms contradict each other. For example, many commanders complain about the length of UDL training. From the commander's perspective, it is very taxing on the unit to have to give up "one of my best people" for an entire week at a time, to attend training. At the same time, some of these same commanders complaint that the product of UDL training, the "finished" Discussion Leader, is of limited value. He or she learns only enough to have an understanding of the process of presenting a unit EO seminar, but must take additional time from the job to put together a seminar on a specific topic.

The UDL is more likely to be trained in the process of EO education and training than in the content of "race relations." A high-quality, intelligent, self-motivated UDL, then, often wants to take another week or ten days to put together a unit seminar with real potential educational value. This takes time away from the unit mission, often to the added displeasure of the commander.

From the EO staff member's perspective, especially one who prepares and conducts UDL training, the program is seen as having other faults, some directly related to the commander complaints described above. The length of time allocated to UDL training is often seen as inadequate. Some UDL courses consist of as little as 20 hours of classroom work and no practical experience. Others run to one 40-hour week, and some as high as 80 hours, including practice in preparing and presenting unit seminars. Unfortunately, the shorter courses are more often found than the longer, and some installations have no such course.

A second source of complaints from the EO staff perspective involves the selection of individuals to attend UDL training. Whereas the commander is usually asked to send people who are mature, self-motivated, of sufficient rank to carry some authority, and above all, volunteers, the complaint is often heard, from primary-duty EO staff, that most UDL candidates are selected by their commanders because they are "duds," and could be spared from the unit mainly because they were not very productive anyway. To the extent that selection standards are established, commanders are accused of ignoring or circumventing them. Many UDL graduates themselves state that they did not volunteer and did not want to attend. Some say they were sent only because of an injury or recent illness which reduced their ability to perform an assigned task in the unit. Obviously, the commander and the instructor often have different criteria in mind where UDL training is concerned.

UDL course graduates, of course, vary considerably in their skills. Some individuals who began as UDLs and were successful later have been able to go to DRRI to acquire the OOU MOS. Others have essentially resigned their additional duties as UDLs, by failing to perform adequately and losing the support of the needed respect of unit members.

The fact remains, however, that the Unit EO Training Program is a potentially valuable tool in achieving the EO Program's objectives. It is, by regulation, the commander's program, as are numerous other programs. The primary-duty, DRRI-trained EO

staff member who has the time to assist the commander to prepare company-level EO seminars, the mission to do so, and is in an organizational location accessible to the company, battery, troop or detachment commander, is an extreme rarity and is likely to become even more rare in the future. For this reason, the UDL becomes a key element in the Unit EO Training, and in turn training for UDLs is extremely important.

Several recommendations for the future of UDL training follow. It is recommended that:

1. Department of the Army establish a uniform course of instruction for Unit Discussion Leaders and that there be a requirement that every Army installation, world-wide, conduct such a course of training on a regularly-scheduled basis, frequently being determined by local need.

2. Department of the Army establish minimum selection standards for UDL training, and that local UDL course instructors be empowered to reject any nominee who does not meet those standards. The standards should include truly voluntary participation.

3. UDL training be structured to include coverage of the comprehensive EO Education and Training Model in general, and the Unit EO Training Component in particular.

4. UDL training include use of the diagnostic survey as a means for assessing actual or potential problem areas in units.

Potential Problems in the Recommended Delivery System

Some of the more immediate problems anticipated as growing out of the recommended delivery system were discussed or alluded to above. Chief among these are: the problems associated with yet another reexamination and possible restructuring of the DRRI mission and curriculum immediately in the wake of recent changes; availability of a Unit EO Diagnosis and Assessment Survey to support and supplement the Unit Training Component of the model; the availability of sufficient numbers of DRRI graduates to fill the instructor slots which would be created and those which now exist but do not require a DRRI graduate; and problems associated with maintaining command presence and participation in the

Unit EO Training Component as well as upgraded support for commanders in the form of better qualified and better trained Unit Discussion Leaders.

These are not problems which can be simply resolved, especially in a period when the human resources pool available for such assignments in the Army is shrinking. Nevertheless, the model, as proposed here, would require facing and dealing with these problems at DA and MACOM level, and with the active involvement of MILPERCEN. The need to fill all of the proposed training positions with skilled and qualified personnel is probably the biggest pragmatic barrier to implementation of the model. But if, as many people believe, EO education and training will continue to play a large role in preparing Army units to perform their military missions (perhaps even more than in the past due to the increasing numbers of minority soldiers in the Army), the filling of these slots as recommended should have a more than adequate payback to the Army.

CHAPTER VII

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TRAINING ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK

An element which has been noticeably missing in the Army's EO education and training program is an evaluation component designed to assess the program's operations and outcomes, and provide corrective feedback. To the extent that such assessment has been performed, it has been done on a piecemeal basis, and the results have seldom been effectively used to change the program. Major program analyses have been conducted by ARI for assessing Unit EO Training,[12] the DRRI Army program,[13] and EO training in the service and professional schools,[14] but these were one-shot efforts and not part of a systematic, ongoing program of evaluation. DRRI did, however, have its own program for evaluation and feedback aside from the ARI studies.

One thing has become clear to those who have been associated with the Army EO Program over the years, and that is that the program must be flexible and adaptive, so as to keep pace with changing objectives and the changing definition of "the EO problem" in the minds of Army members. But while it has been widely recognized that these changes have occurred and are still occurring, the education and training element of the program has been cumbersome and slow to adapt to the changes. Even those changes which have been built into the program have had less than their desired effects. In part, this is because the changes only arrived after many Army members, particularly enlisted and officer leaders, had already stereotyped the education and training component as an inflexible, repetitive, vengeful effort to "bring up past history," "make whites of today feel guilty for the transgressions of their ancestors," "get whitey," and so forth. Had the program been more sensitive to these issues at an earlier stage, it is possible that the EO program might not have had so negative an image as it has today. A systematic assessment and feedback effort would have helped in achieving that goal.

[12] Robert L. Hiett and Peter G. Nordlie, 1978, *op. cit.*

[13] Byron G. Fiman, Ph.D., 1977, *op. cit.*

[14] William S. Edmonds, Peter G. Nordlie, HSR; and James A. Thomas, ARI, 1978, *op. cit.*

Objectives of the Assessment Component of the Model

The goal of the assessment and feedback component of the model is to provide decision-makers at all levels in the EO Program with information that can be used to modify EO education and training in ways which will better serve to achieve the overall objectives of the Program. The assessment component will include both process evaluation and impact assessment elements. The former approach provides information on whether or not the training methods and approaches being used are being properly implemented and are suited to the target audience and to the content. Impact assessment attempts to answer questions about whether the desired learning outcomes have been achieved and whether or not that which is learned is translated into behaviors which contribute to the elimination of discrimination.

The assessment and feedback component of the model is intended as a systematic, continuous, integrated and comprehensive approach to program evaluation, using a planned approach to data collection at local (school or installation), MACOM, and DA levels. The data will be used for periodic revision of EO education and training approaches in a constant effort to upgrade their quality and their value to the Army.

Assessment Methods

Each major component of the Army EO Education and Training Model described here has its own methods for assessment and feedback. These methods have been described as each component was described. These methods can be summarized briefly as follows:

1. Process evaluation

    a. Student critiques.

    b. Self-evaluation by local instructors.

    c. Evaluation by outside observers, e.g., from TRADOC/EO.

    d. Review of student critiques and local evaluation results by TRADOC/EO.

    e. Independent evaluation, e.g., by the Army Research Institute (ARI).

2. Impact assessment

   a. Pre- and post-training tests of knowledge, measures of attitudes and perceptions.

   b. Local evaluation against specific learning objectives.

   c. Longitudinal evaluation of outcomes by an outside agency, e.g., ARI.

   d. Longitudinal evaluation of MACOM and DA statistics by appropriate agencies, e.g., FORSCOM/EO, TRADOC/EO, DA/DCSPER, etc.

The methods, however, represent only a relatively small, albeit important, part of the assessment and feedback process. The key to successful evaluation is the implementation of a systematic plan for a scheduled collection of specific types of data using standardized instrumentation. This is a complex process.

First, teaching materials and programs of instruction must be developed for each separate component of the model. These will be based on objectives such as those proposed in this report, carried to successively greater levels of detail in the form of terminal learning objectives (TLO). Once the POI are available, standards must be developed against which success can be measured. This applies to training methods as well as to desired outcomes.

The next step is the design of evaluation instrumentation. For process evaluation, this will involve the development of: standardized student critique sheets; observation checklists for independent observers; guidelines for internal evaluation at the local level; and a procedure for aggregating, analyzing and interpreting all of these kinds of data at higher levels. On the impact assessment side, materials and procedures must be designed and tested for pre- and post-training assessment of changes in student knowledge levels, attitudes, perceptions and, to the extent feasible, behavior, and for the aggregation, analysis and interpretation of statistical data which reflect changes in personal and institutional discrimination.

Both process and impact assessment will have need for the design and implementation of long-term evaluation studies by independent observers. In addition, a system should be developed for the evaluation of statistical aspects of Unit EO Training, such as who attends and how often. Although this is not the central element in the evaluation of unit training, it does have a role in the process. It is important, however, that each

individual's personnel record be kept up to date concerning his or her attendance at formal courses of instruction in which EO education and training is provided. It becomes apparent, then, given all these requirements, just how complex a system of evaluation and record-keeping for the

It is also apparent that timing is important. In order to achieve maximum effect from the assessment component, its implementation must begin at the same time as the implementation of training under the model begins. Baseline data for statistical measures of discrimination must be acquired prior to the start of the new program so that comparisons can be made. Questionnaires, record-keeping forms and procedural guidelines for evaluation must become available for each training module when that module is about to be implemented. The longitudinal evaluation plan must be ready for implementation when training begins, if maximum utility of data is to be achieved. Assessment must be an integral part of the model, and not a later, retrospective reaction to some demand for accountability from Congress or another external source.

The Feedback Loop

Feedback of the results of evaluation process to decision-makers at all levels is the chief reason for implementing a program assessment. The need to improve the methods by which training is delivered and to adapt training content to changes in the environment, relies on the assessment component for input. Constant monitoring of both process and outcomes are only beneficial if their results are applied to the modification of methods or content.

In each school, the instructional staff must be constantly studying training methods to determine what changes in approach appear to be required to upgrade the local training program.

At TRADOC, constant surveillance is necessary to detect the need for program modifications which will affect more than one installation or school.

And at MACOM and DA level, monitoring of the overall trends in indicators of discrimination must be a constant process if effects of training are to be identified and modifications in training methods or content are to result from analysis of those indicators.

All of these are functions of the feedback loop.

Summary of the Assessment Component

Continuous assessment of EO training and education and feeding back of assessment results to the modification of training methods and content are required if the EO education and training program is to remain flexible, adaptable to changing conditions, and effective in the elimination of discrimination from the Army.

Each of the major EO education and training components must be evaluated from three perspectives: attendance by individuals; training methods and approaches; and content of the POI.

Each of these aspects of program assessment must be carried out at several levels:

- each school or installation must monitor its own program;
- TRADOC must monitor and evaluate training in the schools;
- Each MACOM must monitor and evaluate unit EO training at its installations; and
- DA/DCSPER must be responsible for overall, long-term monitoring of Army-wide impacts of training.

Each major component of the model has specific methods by means of which the assessment may be accomplished. Thorough evaluation strategy requires a multifaceted approach in which each method is employed in ways best suited to it, and in which the data from all possible sources are combined to provide feedback to each of the levels described above. The methods include:

1. Process evaluation

   a. Student critiques

   b. Self-evaluation by local instructors

   c. Evaluation by outside observers, e.g., from TRADOC/EO

   d. Review of student critiques and local evaluation results by TRADOC/EO.

   e. Independent evaluation, e.g., by ARI.

2. Impact assessment

   a. Pre- and post-training tests of knowledge, measures of attitudes and perceptions.

   b. Local evaluation against specific learning objectives.

   c. Longitudinal evaluation of outcomes by an outside agency, e.g., ARI.

   d. Longitudinal evaluation of MACOM and DA statistics by appropriate agencies, e.g., FORSCOM/EO, TRADOC/EO, DA/DCSPER, etc.

Assessment must take place in a planned and systematic manner. This will require the development of materials and procedures for evaluation of each separate training module. Responsibiliites for these tasks should be assigned and coordinated from Department of the Army level, through the MACOMs, to insure standardization and uniformity.

Assessment materials and procedures must be ready for implementation prior to the initiation of training under this model.

The ultimate goal of all aspects of the assessment component is to provide feedback to decisionmakers at all levels so that improvements in the EO education and training program can be made in a timely manner. This can only be done if the entire assessment and feedback component is designed as a unified system, centrally controlled, with clear and appropriate assignment of responsibilities, for example:

- overall policy to HQ/DA/DCSPER/HRD/OEOP and the MACOMs;
- doctrinal development to TRADOC;
- research elements of the system to the Army Research Institute;
- instrument development to TRADOC and/or ARI;
- monitoring of evaluation efforts to the MACOMs; and
- circulation of feedback to be integrated into course curricula by TRADOC.

CHAPTER VIII
APPLICATION OF THE MODEL TO THE ARMY RESERVE AND ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

The model is based on the requirements of the active Army and on its education and training system. To be complete, the model must also be equally applicable to the requirements and to the structure the the Reserve Components. Fortunately, there is more similarity than dissimilarity on these dimensions between the active and the reserve components.

The Army Reserve

The Army Reserve is subject to the same EO regulations as is the active Army. The responsibilities exercised by Reserve officers and NCOs at comparable levels in comparable assignments are essentially identical to those of active Army officers and NCOs. The same unit-specific problems concerning personal and institutional discrimination and the ensuing requirements for Unit EO Training to resolve them are potentially the same in active and reserve units. And basically the education and training system in the active Army also applies to the education and training of members of the Army Reserve. In virtually every major respect, then, a model of EO education and training applicable to the active Army should apply equally well to the Reserve.

The major difference in education and training between the two is in the format taken by the specific courses. Whereas an active duty, Regular Army member, as a full-time "employee" of the Army, can be given a specific assignment to attend a professional development course or school on a full-time basis, the same is usually not true for members of the Reserve. A more frequent procedure in the Reserve is for the student to be allowed (assigned) to attend a specific course of study at a Reserve Training Center in lieu of attending his or her unit's regularly scheduled drills.

Another education and training option is for the member to take correspondence courses in fulfillment of specific professional development course requirements. In this case, as with study at the Reserve Training Centers, it is stipulated that the student spend the final two weeks of any given correspondence program in residence at the active

Army school through which the course is offered. This is a quality-control measure, involving tests of the student's skills and knowledge acquired through correspondence study.

The three available options for the Reserve member, then, are: full-time attendance at the Army's schools; study on a part-time basis at a Reserve Training Center, followed by a two-week stint at the school; or study *via* correspondence course, again completed by a two-week residence period at the school. The schools, the courses, and the education and training experiences, however, are identical for the active Army and for the Army Reserve. As a result, the model for EO education in the schools is equally applicable to both, with the exception that the methods of instruction and the actual materials used will obviously be different for a resident course as compared to a correspondence course. The objectives and content, and the measures employed to test student mastery of specific skills and knowledge will be identical.

In regard to Unit EO Training, and Training for Supervisors, Leaders and Managers, there is no reason to anticipate any different set of requirements, either. The time available for carrying out the recommended training, and the availability of an adequate number of appropriately-trained EO staff to carry out the training will present even greater problems for the Reserve than for the active Army in these two components, particularly. Nevertheless, the basic conceptual model for EO education and training appears equally applicable overall for both active and reserve units and members.

The Army National Guard

Many of the comparisons made above between the Regular Army and the Army Reserve also apply to the comparison with the Army National Guard. The main point of departure for the Guard is in regard to the conditions under which professional development courses can be taken. For a member of the Guard to undertake full-time study in a resident course of instruction would ordinarily involve the applicant's being granted a leave of absence from his or her full-time job for the length of the course, then competing for admission against a large number of other applicants for a small number of student positions. Such full-time attendance, while not totally non-existent, is rare.

Neither can the Guard member attend a non-residential training center on a part-time basis as can the reservist. Such centers do not exist for the Guard. Most members of

the Guard, then, complete the required courses *via* mail correspondence. This, too, requires two weeks residence at the active Army school for testing and general evaluation of the results of the correspondence course.

One final distinction between the Guard and the Reserve and Regular Army in regard to formal schooling is that each State's Guard operates its own Officers' Candidate School (OCS). There appears to be no reason, however, that a common curriculum could not be developed for the active Army OCS and the Guard OCS.

The same problems mentioned earlier in connection with the Reserve's use of the Unit EO Training Component and the Supervisor, Leader and Manager Component, shortage of time and of personnel particularly, will apply to the case of the Guard. The same conclusion applies here, however, in that the model is applicable to the Army National Guard and is proposed for implementation within the Guard's resource limitations, in so far as possible.